CATHOLIC LIBRARY PROBLEMS

◆

KANE

LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
APR 29 1940
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

Z665
.K16

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2024 with funding from
Princeton Theological Seminary Library

https://archive.org/details/catholiclibraryp00kane

CATHOLIC LIBRARY PROBLEMS

LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
APR 29 1940
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

CATHOLIC LIBRARY PROBLEMS

BY

W. KANE, S.J.

Librarian of the
Elizabeth M. Cudahy Memorial Library
Loyola University, Chicago

LOYOLA UNIVERSITY
Chicago
1939

Cum Permissu Superiorum

Copyright, 1939
By Loyola University

Printed by
The Effingham County Printing Company
Effingham, Ill.

To

The Memory

of

LEONARD NILES ANSON

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION xi

CHAPTER I

BACKGROUNDS 1
- 1. The Remote Background 1
- 2. The American Scene 6
  - A. The general environment 7
  - B. The growth of libraries 8
  - C. Library techniques 11
  - D. The place of the library in education 14
  - E. Librarians and librarianship 17

CHAPTER II

CATHOLIC LIBRARIES IN THE UNITED STATES...... 21
- 1. The General Position of Catholic Libraries.... 21
- 2. Kinds of Catholic Libraries..................25
- 3. The Growth of Catholic Libraries............. 27
- 4. The Place of Libraries in Catholic Education.. 32
- 5. Catholic Librarians 35

CHAPTER III

PROBLEMS OF LIBRARY ADMINISTRATION........ 38
- 1. The Character and Aims of the Library...... 38
- 2. The Position of the Catholic Librarian....... 43
- 3. The Library Budget........................ 45
- 4. The Library Routines....................... 47
- 5. Administrative Relations in a School Library.. 51

CHAPTER IV

PROBLEMS OF BOOK SELECTION.................. 55
- 1. The Field of Choice........................ 56
- 2. The Criteria of Library Needs and Library Resources 58
- 3. Special Catholic Aspects of Book Selection.... 62

4. AIDS IN BOOK SELECTION 66
    A. Positive aids 67
    B. Negative aids 69
5. SOME MINOR PROBLEMS 71
    A. Periodical material 71
    B. Allocating the book budget 73
    C. Discarding useless books 74

CHAPTER V

PROBLEMS OF CLASSIFYING BOOKS 76
1. THE NATURE AND PURPOSE OF LIBRARY CLASSIFICATION 80
2. SOME GENERAL PROBLEMS OF THE THEORY OF CLASSIFICATION 82
    A. The theory of uniformity in classification 83
    B. Classification of knowledge vs. classification of books 85
    C. The theory of expansibility 86
3. CATHOLIC ASPECTS OF THE THEORY OF CLASSIFICATION 88
4. PRACTICAL PROBLEMS IN CATHOLIC LIBRARY CLASSIFICATION 91
5. SOME CATHOLIC SOLUTIONS 93
    A. The Brussels Expansion, or Classification Decimale 95
    B. The Vatican Library Classification 96
    C. An Alternative Classification for Catholic Books. 97
    D. Comment and suggestion 98

CHAPTER VI

PROBLEMS OF CATALOGUING BOOKS 101
1. THE PURPOSE OF CATALOGUING BOOKS 101
2. THE MODERN APPARATUS OF CATALOGUING 104
3. THE SITUATION OF CATHOLIC LIBRARIES 108
4. THE SPECIAL PROBLEM OF SUBJECT HEADINGS 111
5. SOME SUGGESTIONS 114

CHAPTER VII

PROBLEMS OF DIRECT READER SERVICE............117
1. The Growth of Direct Reader Service.........118
2. Direct Reader Services in Catholic Libraries...123
    A. Loan services 123
    B. Reference services 125
    C. Promotional services 126
3. The Major Problem in Catholic Libraries.....128
4. Some Problems of Detail.....................132

CHAPTER VIII

PROBLEMS OF TRAINING LIBRARIANS..............137
1. The Art of Librarianship....................139
2. Librarians as Artists.......................140
3. Education For Librarianship.................142
4. The Coming of the Library Schools...........149
5. Catholic Library Schools....................155
6. Some Problems in Training Catholic Librarians 159
    A. The problem of extent of librarian training....159
    B. The problem of library degrees...............162
    C. The problem of maintaining Catholic traditions 163
    D. The problem of control of Catholic library schools 166
    E. The problem of the teacher librarians........168

CHAPTER IX

PROBLEMS OF LIBRARY ASSOCIATIONS............172
1. American Zeal For "Associations"............172
2. The Beginnings of Library Associations.......175
    A. The predecessors of library associations........176
    B. The groundwork of early association of librarians 178
    C. The first convention of librarians............180
3. The American Library Association............181
4. Associations of Catholic Librarians..........184

A. The Library Section of the Catholic Educational Association 185
B. The Catholic Library Association.............189
5. SOME PROBLEMS OF ASSOCIATION AMONGST CATHOLIC LIBRARIANS 192
A. Problems of dispersion.....................193
B. Problems of personnel.......................194
C. Problems of objectives.......................196
D. Problems of leadership......................197
NOTE on "the Catholic tradition in education"..........200
APPENDIX I. U. S. Library Statistics....................203
APPENDIX II. Catholic Library Statistics................205
APPENDIX III. Jesuit Rules for Librarian................208

INTRODUCTION

It must be admitted at the outset that the title of this book covers too much territory, and therefore may deceive the innocent reader. To be a completely honest title, it should have indicated that the book would deal with only Catholic libraries in the United States, and with only some of the problems of those libraries. It should have been one of those fine long seventeenth century titles that tell everything. As a limping apology for this skulduggery, the writer ventures the plea that this book is concerned with librarians, and that librarians like short and handy titles. The temptation to secure brevity at the cost of accuracy is one with which they will, perhaps, sympathize.

There are quite a lot of Catholic libraries in the United States, at least three thousand of them. They offer library services to half a million people or more. There are probably more than four thousand Catholic librarians in the United States, out of whom some four hundred or so are banded together in a Catholic Library Association. There are about a dozen library schools conducted by Catholic institutions. There are two magazines devoted to Catholic library affairs. For the past eight or ten years, Catholic librarians have been struggling to carry out a venture in indexing Catholic periodicals.

Lumped together in that way, all this looks like an impressive amount of library activity. What it looks like in comparison with the work of non-Catholic libraries, is another question. But the first thing to be noted about this Catholic library activity is that most of it is quite recent in origin. It is true that we have a few libraries of an age that is almost venerable by American standards, and two libraries at least whose histories go back unbroken to the earliest days of the Republic. But the greater number of Catholic libraries are young libraries; and practically all of the other library developments here indicated have come about so hurriedly and so recently that they squeak like a new pair of shoes.

Growth and development are always likely to create problems. A sudden development, a very rapid growth, are quite certain to create problems. Nor are Catholic teachers and librarians by any means unaware of their problems. The library situation, although it has not been troubling Catholics for as long a time as the larger difficulties of school education in general, has provoked a good deal of discussion in the past twenty years, both in published articles and in the Catholic educational conventions.

But the discussion has naturally been piecemeal, concerned with particular, rather than with general, Catholic library problems. Moreover, much of that discussion has been carried on by school administrators, religious superiors, and sometimes by teachers, who too often showed little familiarity with the actual functioning of a library. In fact, that Catholic librarians have been so little vocal about the problems of Catholic libraries, is itself one of the problems of Catholic library work which may have to be threshed out in this book.

To admit that fact does not mean to imply that Catholic librarians have been entirely silent about their work, or that they have made no contributions to library study. Not to mention some of the earlier publications (the most ambitious of which was Finotti's *Bibliographia Catholica Americana*, an unfinished work published in 1872), American Catholic librarians have in recent years begun to write some books about library work. They have now to their credit several text books on library methods. There is as least one book on classification by an American Catholic, and there are quite a number of pamphlets and books by Catholics on book lists and similar guides to book selection. An Irish librarian, Stephen Brown, S.J., has written half a dozen books on libraries.

But, except for Father Brown's books, these efforts, excellent spade work though they be, are confined to small corners of the library field; and Father Brown's books have little practical bearing upon the distinctive problems of Catholic libraries in the United States. It would seem, therefore, not inopportune to supplement these detailed studies by some broader view of the Catholic library situation in the United States.

A satisfactory survey of Catholic libraries in this country cannot be done until we have more monographs than we as yet have on the several phases of library work by Catholics, and until we have statistical information much more complete than we now have. But in this matter also it may be that half a loaf is better than no bread. Some attempt at a survey may at least reveal more definitely what must be done by many hands before a real survey is possible. It is in the hope of preparing the way for that more comprehensive view of our Catholic library problems that this little book is to be written.

The scope of the book is limited. In the first place, it will consider only Catholic libraries in the United States. The American environment creates problems for our Catholic libraries different from those of other countries; and for one small book, a pioneer in its field, the American problems are quite enough. If the treatment of those problems should bring out principles that may be applicable to other Catholic libraries, that would be only a welcome by-product. This book will try to envisage, in the crude way possible without accurate data, the general character of American Catholic libraries, and to place them in their relations with the larger world of libraries that surrounds them. It will try to analyze the special difficulties in their organization and working that come to Catholic libraries from their own youth and inexperience, from the administrative structure of the schools in which the libraries function, and from the pressure upon them of an environment in so many ways alien to their purpose and spirit.

Even in this limited aim, there will be no pretense at exhaustive treatment. Not all the problems of Catholic libraries will be touched upon. For instance, the important problem of financing Catholic libraries, about which there is a great deal that should be said by some one, will be passed by. Of the several reasons for not bringing that into this book, the most important is that we are here concerned rather with the direction than with the sources of energy. We may need more libraries, and more money to spend upon libraries; but our more urgent need is to learn to manage better what we have here and now. Until we have learned that, it would be dangerous to give us more money for library work.

Finally, this book will not pretend to solve all the problems it discusses. Problems are not solved by books, anyway, but by people. The achievement at which this book may dare to aim is more modest: to bring out into the clear some difficulties of the Catholic libraries which now, in many instances, are doubly annoying and doubly dangerous because they are not recognized;

and to recall certain established principles of Catholic life and action which may guide librarians in evaluating their problems, or at least help them to avoid disastrous blunders in their efforts to solve them.

In essence, our Catholic library problems in the United States are not new. They are age-old problems cropping up in a new form. They had to be met by the first literate Christians in the Roman Empire, and by all their successors who, in all ages since, have come face to face with the principles and practices of the non-Christian world. The solution of these problems, now as always, must be found in the application of the great truth that libraries, like all other human devices, are means to an end, not an end in themselves. Under the pressure of conditions in the United States, as even so slight a book as this may show, it has become very difficult to apply that principle in Catholic library work. But to abandon the principle for any current fashion of library enthusiasm is to abandon the central Catholic view of all human effort on this earth.

The author is indebted to the staff of the Elizabeth M. Cudahy Memorial Library for help in gathering some of the data presented in this book, and to them as well as to Mr. Paul R. Byrne, Librarian of the University of Notre Dame, who kindly read the MS, for frank and helpful criticism. A book of this sort is commercially a flat tire. Hence it could not have been published except through the sponsorship of Loyola University, and other generous patrons of Catholic libraries. To all of these the author offers his hearty gratitude.

CHAPTER I

BACKGROUNDS

1. The Remote Background

No one knows when the first library was founded. It certainly was not long after the first books were written. The very existence of books is bound to lead to a library; for books have a curious way of gathering together. Books appeal to the acquisitive instinct of men; they are small things, readily portable for the most part, and have a cumulative value. They represent wealth of a sort. If one has enough of them, their possession not only commands the respect due to wealth, but even creates a presumption that their possessor may be a man of culture and wisdom. The man of many books has a twofold social preeminence. As soon, then, as the books exist, some one is most likely to begin collecting them together; and a collection of books is the first definition of a library.

Once libraries had begun to be, they kept on being. Social upheavals often destroyed them: wars, or political or religious fanaticisms. But they sprang up again, or new libraries took their place; the continuity was never completely broken. That fact seems to be an element of human activity that lends itself readily to historical recording; and in fact, the history of libraries has been written abundantly: some of it record of fact, some of it conjecture, some of it special party pleading. There is plenty of obscurity in that history, and there are large gaps; but the main lines of it are fairly well known. We have even material fragments of books still in existence that take us far back into the history of libraries: clay tablets, with incised cuneiform writing, papyrus written with reed pens and inks that seem almost modern, parchment in rolls and in codices, some of them superbly illuminated, and, in the past five hundred years or so, printed books of so many sorts, and in such incredible numbers, as to be bewildering. We have ancient catalogues of libraries, schemes of book classification, accounts of methods of circulating books, even the names of early librarians.

But, despite what would seem to be a wealth of material for the history of libraries, it is not a simple or an easy matter to write that history. There are inevitable human limitations that hamper our management of that history as of all other history. For instance, the history of libraries tends to become more dim and confused at the two extremes, the very remote, and the very near. Lack of details dims the distant history; multitude of details blurs the most recent history. That is true in every field of history. We are forced to admit that we need a certain distance, not too great and not too small, from the historical scene, in order to view it clearly. We have always accepted that limitation when we deal with the very earliest history: except when enthusiasm for the theory of evolution has led us to substitute imagination for fact. But we do not always so easily recognize that our vision suffers as much when the events of history are too near to us as when they are too far away. Accounts written immediately in the shadow of events may be lively and give a vivid sense of detail; but they are too often confused by the very pressure of the near events, too often colored by an emotional impression which prevents an equable estimate of the value of individual facts; they lack perspective, as we say; they cannot fit details of fact into the larger scene. That is one defect to look out for in the history of libraries.

Thus, for example, historical sketches of some of the very early libraries make no pretence at being even moderately complete. We may have facts enough to assure us that there was a Sargon I in Babylonia and that he collected a great number of clay tablets to form an archive or library, but even the experts differ by more than a thousand years in estimating the period in which he flourished, some putting it as far back as 3800 B.C.[1] With twenty rooms filled with books already excavated at Kish by Professor Langdon, the learned men can tell us definitely that the library, which was a school library, flourished about 2000 B.C., that the tablets are mostly dictionaries, grammars, commentaries on laws. That is something: but there still remains great uncertainty about the people who used the Kish library and the way in which they used it, about its foundation and purpose. Its history is only fragmentary.[2] To come even to much later times, what really *was* the library of Alexandria? The guess work about it begins with the number of volumes it contained, estimates ranging from 200,000 to 700,000, and continues through such essential elements of its history as its origin, the character of its book collection, its manner of functioning. Were there actually 600,000 volumes in the Arabic library at Cordova when, in 978 A.D., Almanzor ordered the library destroyed? May we more than suspect guessing in the figure of 120,000 volumes set down for the library of the Fatimids at Cairo, and supposed to have been gathered during the bare hundred years between the destruction of the library by the Turks in 1068 and its dispersal in 1171 by Saladin himself?

---

[1] *The Cambridge Ancient History.* Vol. I, pp. 155 sqq., 402 sqq.

[2] G. H. Bushnell, *The World's Earliest Libraries.* London, 1931. pp. 15 sqq.

There is an uncomfortable insecurity about all that. But one has an equal feeling of insecurity in reading very recent history, such as accounts of the rapid expansion of libraries in Soviet Russia. The facts alleged about quantity of book production, growth of book collections in libraries, wide use of those libraries by the masses of the people, may be reasonably accurate. But are we just as sure about the meaning of the facts? Are the people who write accounts of Soviet library developments capable of estimating the true character of those developments. Every narrative that I have read of that amazing movement raises more questions than it answers.[1] Something of the same uncertainty attaches to very recent history of library developments in other countries too. One is not always sure of solid ground either in the purported record of facts or in the interpretation of the facts. The suspicion constantly crops up that the writers are too close to the scene, that enthusiasm at times takes the place of facts, and that hopes are recorded as accomplishments.

Yet even in the middle distance of history, not all the hazards of the historian disappear. Anti-Catholic bias was strong enough for several centuries to make the stock history of mediæval libraries a travesty of the truth. Now we have a fairly large store of facts at hand about those libraries. Several hundred of their catalogues have been published. Becker alone has printed 136 library catalogues of the 12th century or earlier.[1] Gasquet notes that some of those catalogues are classified in detail, and even have a notation to identify the book which functions exactly as a modern "call number."[2] There is extant a "union catalogue" compiled in the 14th century for 160 Franciscan Convents in England, and called *Registrum Librorum Angliae.*[3] Hunter describes the practice of "inter-library loans" as it existed between Carthusian libraries in 1343.[4] We know something about the prices of mediæval books, and how they were acquired by monastic libraries. In fact, there would seem to be enough data now, and enough good monographs on details, for a reliable history of the mediæval libraries; and perhaps we are getting a sufficiently detached point of view, free from the bitter partisanship of earlier generations, to make the writing of such a history possible.

---

[1] These are a few sample articles on Soviet libraries: L: Haffkin-Hamburger, "The Moscow Institute for Library Sciences," in *Library Journal*, 1925, vol. 50, pp. 991-993, and "Libraries in the Soviet Union," in *Libraries*, 1926, vol. 31, pp. 502-506; "Library Progress in Russia," *Libraries*, 1930, vol. 35, pp. 454-455; H. G. Eddy, "Beginnings of United Library Service in U.S.S.R.," in *Library Journal*, 1932, vol. 57, p. 61; A. Berthold, in *Wilson Bulletin*, 1936, vol. 10, p. 159, summarizes an article on "Self-education and the Library" from the leading U.S.S.R. library journal; Margaret P. Coleman, "America, Russia, and Adult Education," *Wilson Bulletin*, 1935, vol. 10, pp. 235-239, and a correspondence on her article, with reply by Miss Coleman, in vol. 10, pp. 403-405; W. C. Haygood, "Libraries in the U.S.S.R.," *Library Journal*, 1936, vol. 61, pp. 435-439, and "Soviet Union Libraries," *ibid.*, 1937, vol. 62, p. 297.

In the period following the Middle Ages and the fifteenth century Renaissance, some of the great modern libraries had their beginnings. The history of a number of those libraries has been written with satisfying accuracy and fulness. One need think only of the Vatican Library, the Escorial, the Mazarin. But the large development of libraries through that period is still far from clear. It may be only ignorance on my part, but I do not know of any adequate treatment of, for instance, the effect of the Protestant Revolt of the sixteenth century on the history of libraries. The links between the two are strong. But they may have to be traced much more through the indirect effects of the Revolt than through its direct effects: through such intermediate influences as the increased reading of the Bible, the rapid commercial and industrial changes in Protestant lands, the flood of controversial publications, the reforming spirit carried into school education, the hope of moral and religious improvement to be brought about by the growth of literacy and the reading of books. In a word, they would have to be traced through all the complex forces that have produced a distinctly Protestant culture in various lands.

---

[1] G. Becker, *Catalogi Bibliothecarum Antiqui.* Bonn, 1885.

[2] F. A. Gasquet, *The Old English Bible and Other Essays,* new edition. London, 1908, pp. 24-25. See also the classification schedules of Richard of Fournival, *Biblionomia,* written about 1250, published in L. Deslisle, *Cabinet des manuscrits de la Bibliothèque Nationale.* Paris, 1868-1881. II, 518-535; III, 387 sqq. E. Edwards, *Memoirs of Libraries,* 2 vols. London, 1859. Vol. I, pp. 122-236, publishes the catalogue of the library in Christ Church Priory, Canterbury, compiled about 1300, and containing nearly 8,000 works.

[3] *The Cambridge Modern History,* vol. I, pp. 592 sqq. on the catalogue of John Boston, Benedictine monk of Bury, a revision and expansion of the earlier Franciscan catalogue.

[4] Joseph Hunter, *English Monastic Libraries,* London, 1831, pp. 16-17. See also H. Weidmann, *Geschichte der Bibliothek von St. Gallen.* Berlin, 1842.

All the elements of that historical connection are intensely controversial in character and in the way in which they are viewed by historians. Catholic partisanship and Protestant partisanship still further complicate a situation which of itself is complex enough. Nor is it easy to dissect away the influence of Protestantism on libraries, and consider it apart from the increase of book production which came about as a result, not only of the European invention of printing (some six centuries later than its invention by the Chinese), but more particularly of the mechanical speeding up, in the nineteenth century, of the processes of making paper, casting and setting types, making impressions from the types, and binding books. All of these inventions are interwoven with the religious, social, and commercial changes which have made our modern world the confusing thing that it is.

Finally, the history of libraries, especially in the last half dozen centuries, has been closely bound up with the history of schools and of education. It shares, therefore, in the contentiousness and special pleading which has marked so much of the history of education, a department of history in which theory is forever getting in the way of fact, in which even a real fact can be looked at from so many angles that the effect is kaleidoscopic. So we find theories about the place of libraries in education all too frequently obtruding themselves in what purport to be narrative accounts of library developments, and the hopes of librarians allowed to color the facts of history quite as appealingly as the hopes of educators have done. One may even say that the consequent confusion in the history of libraries becomes more pronounced as that history is more recent; in a quite natural way, lyricism creeps into the record of yesterday more readily than into the record of a century ago.

The long and intricate history of library development which has been hinted at in these paragraphs forms the remote background for a discussion of Catholic library problems of today. If this book were to venture any great distance into those problems, it would have to dwell a good deal upon that remote background. But since it limits its view to the confines of the United States, writer and reader are spared the effort to enter into the maze of our slow and unsteady achievement, through the long centuries, in recording and gathering together the little knowledge of each generation of men, and our efforts to manage that knowledge and put it into some transferable form to be passed on, in the limited and partial way possible to men, for the instruction and guidance of succeeding generations.

Most of the 40,000 or more librarians in the United States know very little about that remote background of library history. Its recognized influence upon their work as librarians is infinitesimal. Even its unrecognized influence is not as great as that of more recent developments. But it stands, recognized or not, back of all our efforts here and now, as our intellectual and spiritual heritage. It has made possible the career of librarians who may ignorantly scorn their heritage and deny its value. Even a narrow little study of library problems, such as this book is, must in decency at least make a bow to it.

2. The American Scene

The immediate background for our study of Catholic library problems in the United States must be looked at a little more closely. Some facts and relations in the history of library development in the United States stand out clearly enough. Some of them are obscured by the hurly-burly of near events, the crowding of emotional issues, or are distorted by a prejudiced view. All the present writer can do is to recognize, and try to allow for, his own limitations in grasping that history, and go ahead despite his handicaps, known or unknown.

A. The General Environment

The first of the large facts to be noted is that library history in the United States began in a civilization that had already established its distinctive character, and that the impress of that civilization was never entirely to be lost. One may venture a rough analysis of its most pronounced characteristics as these three:

a) It was a civilization organized by and for white people, who lived in contact with large numbers of Indians and Negroes, but who persistently drove the native Indians out into the West, and who owned Negro slaves and trafficked in them. In this it contrasts with the civilization of Latin America, where there was much miscegenation and some social fusion with Indians or Negroes or both.

b) It was not a fragment of European civilization, but something narrower, cruder, and in some ways more vigorous. It was based upon traditions drawn chiefly from seventeenth and eighteenth century England, but it had already greatly modified its borrowed English culture. It had little concern with the traditions of continental Europe, except in so far as these had filtered through post-Reformation England.

c) It was overwhelmingly Protestant in its beliefs and negations, its educational theories, its social approvals and disapprovals, its attitude toward books and libraries. Catholics were comparatively few in numbers and weak in influence when the American libraries began to grow, to develop their techniques, to organize themselves, and to assert their place in the scheme of education. On the other hand, the American people had not yet become so quite indifferent to religion, so nearly atheist, as the majority of them have since shown themselves to be. As one instance of that fact, practically all the schools of the early United States were professedly religious in character.

There have been many changes in American civilization since the early days of the Republic. But something of those three characteristics has remained throughout the changes. Their influence has diminished, but is still felt, and not least in the libraries of the United States. Just as Protestantism carried over, and only gradually lost, some of the traditions of Catholicism, so an agnostic or atheistic civilization in the present United States still bears the marks of its Protestant origins; for these things live in the social conventions and forms of thought long after they have ceased to be active elements of a creed.

B. The Growth of Libraries

When, only two good life-times ago, the United States evolved from some English colonies and began its separate existence as a republic, it did not have very many libraries. Scarcely any of the dozen or so public libraries that had carried over from colonial times possessed more than 5,000 books. The library of Harvard College, with about 13,000 volumes, was the largest in the country.[1] Nor would it be reasonable to look for many or large libraries in such a new country, almost entirely agricultural, sparsely settled, with no cities, and only a few large towns.

The population of the United States then inhabited chiefly the Atlantic seaboard, and was quite small for the huge territory it occupied. In 1780, it numbered only 2,781,000 persons.[2] By 1790, the population had grown to a total of slightly less than four millions, of whom nearly one-fifth were Negro slaves.[3] So far as libraries were concerned, the Indian population can be ignored even more completely than the Negroes.[4] It is only in recent times that any special provision of libraries has been made for either of these groups.

Just how many libraries, and how many books, there were in the United States at the turn of the eighteenth century, we have no way of knowing. For that matter, let it be said at once that library statistics in general are by no means satisfactory either in their completeness or in their accuracy. Greater efforts have been made of late years to make library statistics more reliable; but those efforts have not yet entirely succeeded. In the estimates ventured here, only approximate figures are offered, in the hope that they may at least suggest the facts of library growth in the

---

[1] *The Library of Harvard University.* 4th edition. Cambridge, 1934, p. 19.

[2] *World Almanac, 1938,* p. 272.

[3] 3,140,207 Whites; 694,264 Negroes. *World Almanac, 1938,* p. 251.

[4] Estimated Indian population was 846,000 in 1492 (although many think that figure too large); 294,574 at close of Civil War; and 332,397 in 1930. *Ibid.*

United States. Some of the confused statistics about libraries, gathered for publication by various agencies, will be quoted in Appendix I.

This much is certain, that libraries grew very rapidly in numbers during the first half of our history, that there was a halt, even a relative recession, during and just after the Civil War, and that since 1880 the growth of libraries has been steady and strong. Within the first forty years of the Republic, whilst the population increased a little more than threefold, there are indications that the number of libraries was multiplied as much as ten times.

One specific item of that growth is that in 1836 there were 57 public libraries with more than 10,000 volumes each. By 1876, when the original population had grown tenfold, there were 266 libraries of more than 10,000 volumes each, with a total of nearly seven million books. In that same year, there were 3,647 libraries of more than 300 volumes each, with a total of more than twelve million books. In other words, that second forty years of our history witnessed a relative slacking in library growth, which brought it back about to the level of the increase in population. But by 1929, when the population had tripled that of 1876, the number of volumes in our libraries had been multiplied more than ten times, to about 162,000,000.

Another way of indicating that relative growth of libraries is this. In the first years of the Republic, the public and school libraries together provided an average of one book for about each eight or ten persons in the United States; in 1876, they provided an average of one book for each three persons; and in 1929, an average of one and one-third books for each individual person.

The impression given by such averages must, however, be corrected by what we know of the distribution of libraries throughout the country. The countryside has always been poorer in books and libraries than the cities. That fact holds true, not only for the early United States, but even for the present time. As late as 1934, The American Library Association estimated that no libraries were provided for 44,000,000 of our people, about one-third of the total population. Moreover, the library facilities offered in large cities and large universities are not merely absolutely, but also proportionately, greater than those offered in towns and small colleges.

Thus, of the nearly 11,000 libraries which in 1929 had each more than a thousand volumes, there were nearly 5,000 libraries with less than 3,000 volumes each, and a total book content of less than 8,000,000 out of the gross total of 162,000,000 for the whole United States. On the other hand, about an equal number of libraries, which had more than 5,000 volumes each, accounted for more than 115,000,000 of the total 162,000,000. That means that of two nearly equal groups of libraries, one group had all told only one-twentieth of the library books, whilst the other group had nearly fifteen times as many.

What makes our libraries grow? Naturally, one of the chief sources of library growth is simply growth in book production. It was estimated that our libraries in 1876 were adding yearly a little less than half a million books to their collections: a numerical growth considerably less than half of the annual growth in population. The fact that, between 1923 and 1929, our libraries added more than 35,000,000 volumes, which was nearly three times our numerical growth in population, is primarily due to our having produced that astonishing increase in the number of books.

Here again, we must not look for very exact statistics. The United States Bureau of the Census reported for 1933 a total of nearly 121,000,000 books published. But of these about two-thirds, over 80,000,000 books, were school texts and children's books, most of which do not enter into library collections, and indeed have a very short life. We may roughly estimate that of the total book production in the United States during the last twenty years only about one-twentieth goes to swell the number of volumes in public and school libraries.

Of the two other chief causes of library growth, one is material, and the other is ideological. The material cause is quite simply more money for libraries, coming from public funds and from private gifts. As regards the finances of libraries there is even a greater lack of complete and accurate figures than in other branches of library statistics. Only about forty per cent of the libraries reported on their income for the fiscal year 1929. For those that did report, the total income was over $73,000,000, of which more than seventy percent came from government sources. These same libraries had permanent endowment funds amounting to more than $95,000,000.[1]

The ideological cause of the growth of libraries would demand a whole volume for its proper discussion. For our purpose here, it may be crudely summed up as compounded of three elements: the enthusiasm of librarians, the vogue of school methods which tend to make more and more of the book and less and less of the teacher, and the earnest modern belief that literacy is the most important product of school education and very nearly a social panacea. We may have to consider this cause of library growth again, when we touch upon the place of libraries in the American scheme of education.

C. Library Techniques

A collection of books does not of itself make a library. To be a library, the books must be organized in a way to make them readily usable; and that need becomes more evident as the collection of books is larger. Thus one of the first of library techniques is a method of classifying books, arranging them in some definite order of size or content, or even according to a large outline of the hierarchy of knowledge. That classification also lends itself to a more helpful sort of indexing or cataloguing, intended to introduce a reader to the contents of the library; although a simple alphabetical list of the books will also in some measure serve that purpose. To complete this service, identifying marks may be added to the books and to the corresponding catalogue entries, in order to secure accurate location of the books on the shelves and to lessen the task of finding the books for readers.

The early libraries in the United States fumbled their way through the problems of classification and cataloguing, guided chiefly by the librarian's memories of the practice of English libraries.[2] That practice, in turn, was mainly derived from either

---

[1] *Statistics of Public, Society, and School Libraries, 1929.* U. S. Office of Education. Bulletin 37, 1930, p. 10.

[2] *The Library of Harvard University.* Cambridge, 1934, pp. 16-20. The first catalogues of Harvard Library were no more than alphabetical lists. About 1780, these gave way to a catalogue based upon a subject classification, which was first printed in 1790.

Francis Bacon's[1] or Gesner's[2] schemes, or, more likely, from the so-called "French system" which originated either in the work of Jean Garnier, a Jesuit, or in that of Ismael Boulliau.[3] Jacques Charles Brunet expanded this "French System" upon a combination of the schemes of Garnier and Boulliau, and published it in 1810, in volume VI of his *Manual de Libraire et de l'Amateur de Livres*. The British Museum Scheme, with ten main classes reminiscent of the "French Ssytem," did not come into use until about 1836.

The first of the American contributions to library techniques came through William Torrey Harris, who in 1870 inverted and expanded Bacon's Chart as a basis for classifying the St. Louis Public School Library. Three years later, Melvil Dewey, then only twenty-two years old, adopted Harris' outline and devised a scheme of decimal notations to be used with it. He tried it out for three years at Amherst, where he was an assistant librarian, then published it in 1876. This first edition was of 42 pages, and only a thousand copies were printed. *Decimal Clasification and Relativ Index* (Dewey went in for simplified spelling), now in its 13th edition with 1,647 quarto pages, is used by perhaps ninety percent of American libraries.

Charles Ammi Cutter, the librarian of the Boston Athenæum, published his *Expansive Classification* in 1891. Although librarians often praise it as a more scholarly system than Dewey's Decimal Classification, they have not used it much. Cutter is better known for his cataloguing rules, and especially for the ingenious alphabetic-order tables devised for author indications on library books, now so widely in use as to be called simply "Cutter numbers."

---

[1] For Bacon's Chart, or outline of classification, see *The Advancement of Learning*, in the edition by W. A. Wright, Oxford, 1876. The Library of Congress, which at first classified books only by size, adopted Bacon's Chart as its first basis of subject classification. (William Dawson Johnston, *History of the Library of Congress*. Washington, 1904.)

[2] Conrad Gesner (1516-1565), a Swiss physician and scholar, undertook a huge bibliographic work, *Bibliotheca Universalis, sive Catalogus Omnium Scriptorum Locupletissimus, etc.*, in three parts, of which the second and third were not completed. Two folios were published, Zurich, 1545, 1549. His classification is founded upon the Trivium and Quadrivium of the mediaeval universities.

[3] Jean Garnier, S.J. (1612-1681) published his *Systema Bibliothecae Collegii Parisiensis Societatis Jesu*, Paris, in 1678. (Carlos Sommervogel, *Bibliothèque de la Compagnie de Jesus*, Bruxelles-Paris, 1890, III, 1230,8.) It is a quarto of 118 pages. In the year following, Ismael Boulliau (1605-1694), the astronomer, published at Paris *Catalogus Bibliothecae Thuanae* in two volumes. Boulliau, born into a Protestant family, later became a Catholic and retired to the Abbey of St. Victor, Paris. (*Biographie Universelle*, Paris, 1852-70, VII, 9.)

In 1897-1901, the Library of Congress, which had grown from a few shelves of books at its foundation in 1802 to one of the largest book collections in the United States (it has now nearly 5,000,000 books), compiled a classification system of its own, based upon both the Cutter Expansive and the Decimal Classification. This system has the advantage of a larger number of main classes than the two systems upon which it is founded, and hence is better adapted for very large libraries. Its schedules and subject headings have been published in a dozen large quarto volumes. But despite a vigorous and persistent campaign to popularize the system, it has not been widely adopted for use in other libraries.[1]

With the growth of libraries and the expansion of library services, new problems arose regarding methods of circulating books, and were met by new techniques for registering borrowers, identifying them by cards, and keeping a record of the books lent them. The early system of ledger records gave way to book dummies for each borrower, to be put on the shelves in place of the book borrowed, then to charging slips or cards, often as used in the method devised by Nina E. Browne, a Boston librarian. These were finally developed into a simple scheme of single card entry based on a time record, evolved in the Newark Public Library, and widely known and used as "The Newark System."

Increased size of book collections and multiplication of library services led also to an increased elaboration of management. Library work became very much departmentalized, so that a modern large American library is as highly organized as a factory. Book selection, book ordering, accessioning, classification, cataloguing, inventory, reference and bibliographic work, are dealt with by distinct groups of librarians. To avoid confusion in that large scene, exact routines are mapped out and rigorously followed.

---

[1] *The Report of the Librarian of Congress, 1937*, pp. 241-244, states that the L. C. Classification has been adopted by 194 libraries; in the United States, by about one percent of the nearly 16,000 libraries.

D. The Place of the Library in Education

These fairly abundant American libraries, with their well established techniques, where do they fit into the American scheme of education? What is their place in that scheme, both in theory and in practice? Certain large answers can be given to this sort of question, even though in detail the library program may be as blurred and confused as is American education itself.

There are plenty of persons who think that education in the United States is such a bewildered affair that it has no ascertainable theory or aim, that it is in a muddled stage of transition, without either clearly defined principles or ultimate term of transition, and hence presents a prospect, not of being something, but only of indefinitely being on its way to something. They even say upon occasion that the leaders of American education do not really know their own minds in the matter. But, granted that the contention and confusion in American education is very great, it would be a mistake to conclude from that fact that there is no underlying theory fairly common to American educators. In fact, it might be wiser to explain the confusion, not by lack of theory, but by the character of the theory actually maintained.

That theory is, in general, pretty evidently the Baconian theory: that man is illimitably perfectible here on this earth, and that he can be perfected by education understood as the acquisition of knowledge; since the acquisition of knowledge means the certainty of power over natural forces and over man's own vagaries and ineptitudes in the management of his affairs. It is fundamentally a deistic and naturalistic theory of education. Schools are its chief implementing; and literacy is its immediate achievement, and the first measure of its practical application.

In such a theory of education, libraries become at once important tools, perhaps the most important of all tools. The schools equip individuals with skill in reading; the libraries furnish them with both exercise in that skill and the material upon which it will work further toward some vague goal of complete human accomplishment. The library is the full complement of the school; and the two together are to be the earthly salvation of mankind, the sources of material prosperity, social security, and moral equilibrium. They will destroy poverty, war, crime, and, to a considerable extent, disease. They will make the world safe for democracy. One might fill an encyclopedia with statements emphatically expressing that theory and that hope.

The place of the library in American schools is assured. Less than a life-time ago, the library was a minor feature of the school, now it is a major feature; and its place becomes more prominent as school education mounts up through secondary schools, colleges, and universities. The powerful "standardizing agencies" for schools in the United States have for the past thirty years laid great emphasis upon the quantity of books that a school must have in its library. That emphasis is a natural corollary from the tendency in modern methods of teaching, which are increasingly based upon books, and more books. So long ago as 1915, the Assistant Librarian of Columbia University proudly announced that a teacher at Harvard had issued a syllabus of 116 pages for a course on the History of the West in the United States, citing "2,100 separate readings contained in 1,300 volumes."[1] What the rank and file of students did, or could do, with the 1,300 books, is another story. It is, however, not astonishing that the U. S. Office of Education should report, for 1934, that the college and university libraries of the United States had nearly 58,000,000 bound volumes, about one-third of all the library books in the country.

But libraries in the United States look far beyond the schools. In buildings, wealth, size of book collections, the public libraries surpass school libraries. There was a time, not so long ago, when the main function of the public libraries seemed to be to supply the people with recreational reading, chiefly in fiction. The public libraries have for some years been apologizing for that fact. They are striving earnestly to establish themselves as serious agents of general education. They make enthusiastic reports about the increased circulation of what some of them naively call "non-fiction" books.

The program of library activities listed in a pamphlet by the Detroit Public Library is representative of most, if not of all, of the large public libraries. It stresses, besides its usual loan service, guidance for parents and teachers in books about children, consultation service for the cultural and vocational reading of adults, compiling reading lists, sending collections of books to vacation camps, conducting story hours for children, providing technical, financial, and commercial information for industrialists and business men. Some of the library schools are even giving special courses in *Story-telling* for librarians who are to work with pre-school children.[1]

---

[1] Frederick C. Hicks, "Library Problems in American Universities," in *The Educational Review*, New York, 1915. Vol. 49, pp. 325-336.

In 1924-1926, the American Library Association, with funds provided by the Carnegie Corporation of New York, made a study of the "work of libraries for adults and for older boys and girls out of school." The resultant report was published in 1926 as *Libraries and Adult Education.* Although three appendices (pp. 221-268) are taken up with an account of the work done by libraries in this sort of education, the A. L. A. Commission indicated its dissatisfaction with the quantity of the work. It emphasized the opportunities for future development of library endeavor in that field of education, upon the clearly set forth supposition that if people can be induced to read books they will become educated. Hence the recommendations of the Commission, embodied in a book of 284 pages, reduce to two: teachers and librarians must promote reading; writers and libraries must provide attractive books to be read. It is quite as simple as that.

But the A. L. A. Commission was aware that there were difficulties in the way. The people may not be what Alexander Hamilton called it, "a great beast"; but neither is it spontaneously enthusiastic toward the work involved in continuing its education through the use of libraries. There is evidence enough that the present place of the library in American education is not the result of an unurged popular demand, but that it has been created by the efforts of librarians and others to stimulate a reluctant demand. The hope of enlarging that position of the library in education to an ideal dominance must depend, as the Commission realized, upon still more strenuous efforts by librarians. That naturally leads us to consider the last factor in the library situation, the librarians themselves.

---

[1] A visiting English librarian reports with enthusiastic approval on this type of library work in the United States. Henry A. Sharp, *Libraries and Librarianship in America.* London, 1936. Chapter 6.

E. Librarians and Librarianship

Are the librarians the last factor in the library problem? Or are they the first? It is like the question about the hen and the egg. Just as there can be no librarians without libraries, so there can be no libraries without librarians. They produce each other. But the library depends more upon the librarian than the librarian does upon the library. It is the librarian who really creates the library, who selects the books, who organizes the services, who, in a word, determines whether the library is to be a competent aid to scholars or just a mess of books. A good librarian can do wonders with meagre resources; a bad librarian can destroy the effective value of even a fine book collection.

There are about 40,000 librarians in the United States, good, bad, and indifferent; to whom may be added an undetermined number of library trustees, student assistants, maintenance workers, and teacher-librarians in small schools, amounting in all to perhaps another ten or twelve thousand. In the past forty years, the number of librarians has increased rather rapidly, except during the depression years of the 1930's. When, in 1935, the country began to climb out of the economic doldrums, some 2,000 librarians were added to the rolls.[1] The rate of growth in their numbers is related, not only to the increase in book collections, but also quite notably to the multiplication and spread of library services. Thus, for example, in the period 1923-1929 the number of librarians grew nearly three times as rapidly as the number of volumes in libraries, or nine times as rapidly as the growth in population.

Three of the great changes that have taken place in the qualities of librarians between the earlier years and the present deserve to be noted. The first is that, like school teachers, librarians used to be mostly men, now they are mostly women. Any one familiar with library work today must be startled to recall that the first library school in the United States, planned by Melvil Dewey in 1883, was held up for four years because Columbia University could not overcome its objections to having women students on the campus.[2] The second change, often discussed in library journals, was summed up by an eminent librarian as long ago as 1904, in the curt statement: "The librarian nowadays is less the scholar and more the man of affairs."[1] Some libraries have become so huge that the librarians can only hope to know "the backs of the books" that they contain.[2] Many libraries have become so highly organized that the librarian's interests are necessarily centered in problems of administration. Increased size and greater elaboration of routines have brought about the third great change: the entry into libraries of a large number of young women capable of little more than the technical goose-step in library work.

---

[1] *Bulletin of American Library Association.* Jan., 1936, p. 39.

[2] *School and Society,* New York, 1937. Vol. 45, pp. 85-86.

Librarians, like poets, used to be born rather than made. (Although some of them, like Pericles' slave who fell out of a tree and could be used only as a pedagogue, became librarians by accident.) But now a considerable number of them are manufactured in library training schools. A great many such schools have sprung up in the fifty years since Melvil Dewey founded the School of Library Economy. Of these, the American Library Association in 1937 listed twenty-seven as "accredited" schools, with nearly 1,300 students enrolled.[3] There are probably at least an equal number of students in the other library schools.

The training offered in all these schools, although it naturally varies a good deal from school to school, has the common excellence of discipline in the routine techniques. That it cannot produce great librarians is a limitation which it inevitably shares with all other technical training. Great physicians, engineers, lawyers are no more purely the product of a school than are great librarians. Unfortunately, not all the persons who pass through training schools to a diploma or degree are aware of that limitation. The library schools are turning out an adequate number of technically competent assistants, some of whom may in time develop the scholarship and judgment necessary to a librarian, but most of whom will, so long as they continue in library work, be followers of a trade rather than members of a profession.

---

[1] Arthur E. Bostwick, *Library Essays.* New York, 1920, p. 94.

[2] One of the great American librarians, William Warner Bishop, has, with disarming humor, entitled his fine collection of essays in librarianship, *The Backs of Books.* Baltimore, 1926.

[3] *Bulletin of A.L.A.* Sept., 1937. Vol. 31, pp. 502-503.

This last fact must not hinder us from appreciating how vigorous and vocal most librarians are in enthusiasm for their profession. It may not be too much to say that they are the most enthusiastic group of people in the United States. Many of them are strikingly devoted to their work. Even most of the rank and file are immensely proud of being librarians, and have an emotional eagerness far beyond their intellectual equipment for librarianship. They are almost notorious as propagandists. Sharp cites, with an exclamation mark, an American public library whose staff members spoke at 1,458 public meetings of various sorts in a single year.[1] American librarians are indefatigable in attending conferences and conventions. They support a dozen library journals and keep alive twelve national library associations and nearly a hundred regional associations.[2]

Of the national library associations, the largest and most important is the American Library Association. The first of the great library associations, it was founded in 1876, a year before the English, and thirty years before the French associations. In 1937, it had 14,204 members, of whom four-fifths were librarians, the rest being administrators, teachers, editors, and persons connected with publishing concerns.[3] Its annual expenditures are around a quarter of a million dollars,[4] and it has over two million dollars of endowment funds.[5] In its aims and functions, it is a combination of professional association and trade union. It is concerned with improving the quality as well as the quantity of librarianship, but it makes the necessary compromises involved in any earnest pursuit of quantity.

The A. L. A. publishes many books and pamphlets on library work, most of them technically very good. Its list of publications covers pages 367-377 inclusive in the 1937 Handbook. It studies library salaries, relative school rank of librarians, and persistently and strenuously strives to gain recognition and compensation for librarians. It promotes schemes for library expansion. To mention only some of its permanent activities, it maintains effective standing committees on Adult Education, Special

---

[1] Henry A. Sharp, *op. cit.*, p. 58.
[2] *Bulletin A. L. A. Handbook,* Nov., 1937, pp. 41-56.
[3] *Bulletin A. L. A. Handbook,* Nov., 1937, p. 358.
[4] *Idem.* Sept., 1937, p. 494.
[5] *Idem. Handbook,* Nov., 1937, p. 40.

Projects, Bibliography, Bookbinding, College Libraries, Education for Librarianship, Federal Relations, Library Extension, Publicity, and Salaries. It has a powerful influence on library training schools. It is working toward the establishment of a Federal Library Agency, and is already linked up in a number of projects with the Library of Congress.

This is confessedly a most rapid and inadequate sketch of the backgrounds, remote and near, against which we are to place our study of American Catholic libraries. But it may serve its purpose, which is to indicate how long and how valiantly persistent has been the struggle of the library to achieve and to hold its place amongst the cultural forces of the world. It would be as stupid to deny nobility to the ideal which inspired that struggle as it would be to believe that it was an ideal which completely fulfilled all of man's capabilities, natural and supernatural.

The efforts to develop the power and influence of libraries have met with a good deal of success, but a success unavoidably limited by our huge human inertia toward all educational work, by the unreality of some of the theories upon which library work has been based, and by that sad rule of human endeavor, that quantity is the enemy of quality. But, whatever limitations one may admit to the success of library development, particularly here in the United States, it is evident that even that limited success was great enough to be impressive, when the Catholic libraries began to struggle into existence out of the poverty of Catholic schools.

CHAPTER II

CATHOLIC LIBRARIES IN THE UNITED STATES

1. The General Position of Catholic Libraries

The Catholic religion and Catholic culture are two quite different things. The first is truly universal, and changes only in the slow way of a divinely safeguarded development. Its dogmatic formulas are fixed, its moral principles are the same in all climes and lands and social circumstances. It has a character instantly recognizable in any part of the world. But Catholic culture, although vitally influenced by Catholic beliefs and principles, is a composite product, a blend of Catholic elements with conventions and attitudes drawn from the immediate environment in which the Catholic culture flourishes.

Since the conventions, opinions, and emotional attitudes of the societies external to the Catholic body frequently change both in their character and in their influence upon Catholic practices, there is no such thing as a universal Catholic culture. There is a Spanish Catholic culture, an English Catholic culture, an American Catholic culture; and the differences between them are often more striking than their similarities. Even in one political group there may be differences, as, say, between the South Germans and the North Germans, between the Bretons and the Marsellais, between the white Catholics and the Negro Catholics in the United States. Sharp observers can detect such differences between the Catholic culture of New England and that of the Middle West.

The confusing and blurring elements in any given Catholic culture are those that come from non-Catholic sources. They are too many to enumerate here. One may think of the distinctions between Jewish Christians and Gentile Christians in the earliest days of the Church for the bases of their different cultures. One may recall the enormous pressure of the Graeco-Roman civilization, through silent infiltration even more than through open persecution, upon the Catholic cultures of the third, fourth and fifth centuries; or the changes wrought in those cultures as the new *mores* of the barbarians came to darken at once and to strengthen the life of the Empire. Catholic culture in France could not be the same after the Revolution as before it.

Hence there is nothing astonishing in the fact that Catholic culture in the United States should have distinguishing marks that set it apart from the Catholic culture of Italy, or of Austria, or of Ireland. Our Catholic culture has borrowed from the world about us, just as theirs has borrowed; but it has borrowed different things. Our Catholic culture in this country has been based upon the teachings of the Catholic Church: but not exclusively upon them. It has never abandoned or denied those teachings: but it has not constantly kept them in the foreground as the immediate guides of its aims and its efforts. That it should do so, is almost humanly impossible, because of the position of Catholics in the United States. We must consider that position for a moment.

There are three possible relations between a Catholic community and the non-Catholic world round about it: persecution, complete indifference, or peaceful aggrandizement of one over the other. The Catholic body in the United States has never been in a position to be itself a persecutor, as it has sometimes been in other countries. Since the formation of the Republic, it has been subject to persecution only in occasional outbursts of anti-Catholic bigotry; it has never suffered persecution of an open and official kind. The second possible relation, one of complete mutual indifference, is only a theoretical possibility wherever the two groups are not physically isolated from each other. It is to the third relation that we should look most closely for its effect upon Catholic culture in the United States.

In the inter-play of opinions, prejudices, cachets, social ideals, educational theories, moral tendencies, criteria in literature, the drama, the arts, the films, where has the preponderance been in our country, on the side of the Catholic minority, of at most one-sixth of the population, or on the side of the non-Catholic majority? To answer that question with any fulness would carry us too far afield for our present purpose. There have been many conversions to the Catholic Church in the United States, although it is doubtful that numerically they equal the "leakage" from

Catholicism. There has been some slight recognition of Catholic social principles, say, as expressed in the encyclical letters of the last four popes, by a few non-Catholic leaders of thought. But the Catholic influence in such instances is immeasurably outweighed by, say, the non-Catholic influence upon Catholics in the toleration of divorce, the use of contraceptives, the condonation of political dishonesty, and the supremacy of wealth.

In that part of our Catholic culture in which libraries are important, there can be no question of the powerful influence exerted by the views and attitudes of the non-Catholic world about us. The pressure of that influence has not always been appreciated. Although now and then it has become irritating to the Catholic ethos, as in the intense fanaticism of prohibitionists, or has galled Catholic administrators, as in the bullying of some educational associations, for the most part it has been exercised smoothly and insensibly, by the sheer force of non-Catholic numbers, wealth, and prestige. The Catholic body in the United States has absorbed an astonishingly large amount of educational ideas from the non-Catholic world of schools and libraries, and has done so imperceptibly, in an unobtrusive gradation through frank adoption of practices to unwitting adoption of principles.

There are so many facts that make for that gradual absorption of non-Catholic principles in library work. Consider only these two facts. First, the Catholic body in the United States is not merely a decided minority, it is also, although legally on a par with other religious organizations, looked down upon as inferior by the non-Catholic majority. It is considered to be, by comparison, poor, timid, unprogressive, tied to outworn traditions, internally hampered in its freedom of action, narrow in its outlook, unproductive in literature and the arts. Catholics themselves, in considerable numbers, accept that comparative estimate and classification of themselves. The very modesty and humility which a Catholic should practice may predispose him to belittle his cultural heritage, to be diffident in adding to that heritage, and to welcome the leadership of those who tell him blandly that they are his superiors in wisdom as in wealth, in real efficiency as in noisy publicity.

The second fact is this: Catholics, for all the short-lived glory of Maryland's tolerance, came late into this country, and came still later into its material prosperity, its abundance of schools, its lavish impressiveness of libraries. The largest Catholic library in the United States is less than one-tenth of the size of Harvard Library, and is outstripped by at least forty other non-Catholic libraries. No Catholic took an outstanding part in the development of library techniques, with the belated exception of William Stetson Merrill, who, in 1928, published his excellent *Code for Classifiers.* All the major achievements of library growth and extension of library services in the United States were already accomplished facts when Catholic librarians began to raise their voices even feebly in the land. It is not astonishing that, when they did speak up, so many of them turned out to be only faithful echoes of what they had heard from the non-Catholic library world.

Any sane estimate of the present position of Catholic libraries in the United States must begin with the honest acknowledgment that, in comparison with other libraries, the Catholic libraries are few in number, weak in book collections, inferior in library buildings, poorly set up in technical routines, and inadequate in staffs. Some of these comparative limitations may be blessings in disguise; but they are, first and foremost, limitations. They foster what the modern jargon calls "an inferiority complex." They do not promote an aggressive assertion of Catholic principles, an alert and vigorous Catholic leadership. That, again, is a matter of fact, not of theory. In theory, the Catholic culture should be inspired by the hardships through which it must struggle to maintain its Catholic character. In fact, when the essentials of its creed are not openly attacked, it is often ready to surrender to difficulties and to accept an alien domination.

The general position of Catholic libraries in the United States may, therefore, be summed up roughly as this: they are a relatively recent development, somewhat handicapped by poverty of resources, belatedly eager to improve their holdings and their techniques, more than a little chagrined by their comparative deficiencies in both of these regards, and so overawed by the apparently triumphal march of the library movement outside of them as to be sometimes uncertain, not merely of their standing, but of the direction in which they are moving. To this must be added that Catholic libraries, like all other agencies of

Catholic culture, also have at their command a store of principles and experience which should be of immense value whenever they earnestly set themselves to make use of it.

2. Kinds of Catholic Libraries

It may help to clear the way for later discussions if we consider for a moment the various sorts of Catholic libraries that have grown up in the United States. First in time, no doubt, were private libraries. The conditions that foster the making of private libraries are quite the same amongst Catholics as amongst non-Catholics: an available supply of books, money for the purchase of books, some appreciation of books, leisure for selecting books, and finally some motive (which may range all the way from social vanity to a devoted love of knowledge) urging one to buy books and gather them into a library. The motive and the taste for books seem to be the indispensable conditions; wealth has more to say about the size of a library than about its quality or even its assured existence.

The successful ventures of such early American Catholic publishers as Steiner, Lloyd, Carey, and Dornin are evidence that Catholics were buying books in the earliest days of the Republic.[1] The printed lists of subscribers for some of Carey's and Dornin's books are eloquent of that fact. Finotti's bibliography of Catholic books for 1784-1820 indicates that these early books were mostly works of piety and of religious controversy (a good deal of the latter amongst Catholics themselves), with many translations in their number, only a very thin sprinkling of books on secular subjects, and practically nothing of a definitely literary character. The clergy and professional men, because of their education and their interests, naturally had the better libraries, some of them of excellent quality and fairly large size.

Next in time came semi-public libraries, owned and managed by groups of Catholics. Perhaps the earliest of these were parish and sodality libraries. John S. Sumner, S.J., the librarian of Georgetown College, wrote, in 1876: "Catholic libraries are also beginning to be formed in cities and towns, chiefly under the auspices of the associations that seek to provide a safe and pleasant resort for young men in the evenings."[1] The rather naive optimism implied in that purpose does not appear to have been fully justified. Parish and sodality libraries, where they continued to exist, have rarely been vigorous organizations, and have catered more to the women than to the young men. Later came such society libraries as that of the American Catholic Historical Society, begun at Philadelphia in 1887, about three years after the founding of the Society,[2] and the fine library of the Central Verein, which has had a sturdy life, and, about 1931, grew into a building of its own at St. Louis, Mo.[3] Still later, Catholic libraries of a rental type came into existence, several of them established by the Calvert Associates.[4] One of these has developed into a diocesan library.[5]

---

[1] See Wilfrid Parsons, S.J., "Early Catholic Publishers of Philadelphia," in *The Catholic Historical Review,* 24:151-152 (July, 1938).

In every way, the most important Catholic libraries in the United States are those connected with schools. First came the seminary libraries, and the libraries collected by the religious orders for the use of their own members. Some of these date from the very first years of the Republic. Then came tiny libraries for the parish schools, often only a few score of books. Later, when Catholic high schools, academies, colleges, and universities were organized, they established larger student libraries. The chief developments, in size, quality, techniques, and services, have been made in the libraries of these higher Catholic schools. For that reason, our study of Catholic library problems will center almost exclusively about the Catholic school libraries.

---

[1] In Chapter IV of *Public Libraries in the United States of America*. U. S. Bureau of Education, Washington, 1876, p. 142. In some of the larger cities, this parish library movement had begun earlier than 1876. According to William J. Rhees, *Manual of Public Libraries*, Philadelphia, 1859, pp. 51-52, The Xavier Union, a parish organization of New York, had, as early as 1857, a library of 5,000 volumes.

[2] William Stetson Merrill, "Catholic Libraries and Librarians in the United States," in *Catholic Builders of the Nation*. New York, 1923. Vol. IV, p. 343. Martin Griffin, the historian (1842-1911), was, at the time of his death, librarian of the Society's library.

[3] *Central-Blatt and Social Justice*, 23:351 - 24:140. St. Louis, Jan., August, 1931.

[4] *The Catholic Bookman*, April, June, 1938, has brief accounts of eight or nine Catholic rental libraries.

[5] Cf. *The Commonweal*, July 23, 1937. 26:276. The Rev. Stephen J. Brown, S.J., in his discursive book, *Libraries and Literature from a Catholic Standpoint*, Dublin, 1937, has some scattered accounts of American Catholic Libraries, chiefly in Chapter I of Part I, pp. 11-34.

It scarcely needs to be said that hardly any of these libraries, private, parish, society, or school libraries, consisted solely of Catholic books. In fact, the book collections of many of them show only a minority of works by Catholic writers, some of them only a quite small percentage. Catholics have not written upon every subject, for one thing; for another, they have often shown themselves inferior when compared with non-Catholic writers in the same field. Finally, in the case of Catholic school libraries, a multitude of non-Catholic books have been thrust upon them by the recommendations of educational associations.

3. The Growth of Catholic Libraries

What is here to be said on this topic will be confined to libraries connected with Catholic schools above the elementary grades. Such schools had to have libraries of some sort as soon as they began to function; and there is scattered evidence that they recognized this need, and made some provision for it. But, up to thirty or forty years ago, Catholic school libraries were looked upon as the tools of the teachers rather than of the students. The students had their text-books, a handful of general reference works, and perhaps a collection of books intended chiefly for recreational reading. Even in the seminaries and colleges that was the common attitude toward the library: it was the hunting ground of scholars, or an arsenal of the professors, not the laboratory of the student body, who in general neither wanted large library facilities nor were considered intellectually ready to use them. It must be emphasized that this view of the use of libraries was not peculiar to Catholic schools, but was common to all schools.

That common view of the library of a lifetime ago seems to arouse mingled feelings of horror and amusement in writers on library topics since "the great awakening" began in the late 1870's. One of the classic stories is that told by Justin Winsor in 1879, of the "warder" of a college library who cried out: "Boys! What are you doing here—this is no place for you!" And Winsor added: "The poor craving creatures slunk away to Euclid and Horace in the seclusion of their bedrooms."[1]

---

[1] Justin Winsor, "College and Other Higher Libraries," in *The Library Journal*, 4:401. (November, 1879.)

Apparently Winsor, and many with him, were naive enough to believe that college boys in any number were "craving" for scholarship, filled with a wild longing for access to the learned tomes upon which their teachers battened. Apparently they considered it a gruelling hardship to have to study Euclid and Horace, a hardship from which they have since happily been freed. And evidently they were unaware of the practice, common at least in Catholic schools, of having two libraries, one for the teachers, and another for the students. The teachers' library was a scholarly collection; the students' library was made up of books selected to suit their tastes and capacities, and was strongest in books for recreational reading.

Dividing the library was an administrative arrangement, the precursor of our present enthusiasm for "departmental libraries." It is condemned by precisely the persons who are loudest in praising "departmental libraries." It may be of interest to note later on that the Catholic religious rules for librarians envisage primarily the teachers' library, and only indirectly or secondarily a library for students.

Once the library had been begun, it was almost inevitably bound to grow in size; and most of the early Catholic libraries did grow, although it must be confessed that in some of them the growth was barely perceptible. Thus, for instance, the library of St. Mary's Seminary, Baltimore, which was founded in 1791, and which reported 12,000 volumes in 1836, forty years later reported only 15,000 volumes, with some interim reports as low as 10,000 volumes.[1] Even when the growth of a library was fairly steady, as, say, that of the Georgetown library from 12,000 volumes in 1836 to 32,268 volumes in 1876,[2] the increase responded to teacher demand, not student demand, and at times the teacher demand seems to have been less than overpowering. It is amusing to read, in an unpublished letter written by John Grassi, S.J., the Rector of Georgetown College, 8 February, 1817, an appreciative notice of some mathematical works in Italian which he had received, and which few, if any, of his students could read. He winds up his account of these additions to the library with a statement in which, one feels sure, many Catholic college administrators of his day could join him: "To tell you the truth, I would prefer to receive from Europe a number of good missionaries than many books, for we have not the time to read even those which we have."

---

[1] *Public Libraries in the United States.* Washington, 1876, pp. 764-765.

[2] *Ibid.*, pp. 762-763.

There are indications here and there that the growth of these libraries was quite slow in the early years. As soon as a fairly sufficient number of books had been got together to meet the immediate needs of the faculty, the strain of supplying the library was relaxed. Thus, the library for the Augustinians at Villanova College, founded in 1842, reported only 5,000 volumes in 1876, and estimated its rate of growth as of about $200 worth of books a year. The library for the students of the college had grown to only 3,000 volumes in thirty years.[1] Woodstock College, the Jesuit seminary begun in 1869, reported 18,000 volumes in 1876, but confessed that its growth had slowed down to a yearly addition of about 200 books.[2]

There was always a good deal of the haphazard about Catholic library growth, which has been even more sporadic and spotty than the general growth of American libraries. One college head might be eager to enlarge the library, and his successor, a few years later, might halt the increase, or even, as has been known to happen, sell off part of the book collection. It is only during the present generation that signs of a fairly persistent growth have begun to be widespread.

Accurate figures about Catholic library growth are hard to get, even for individual libraries. That vague and apologetic imitation of the techniques evolved in non-Catholic libraries, already mentioned, which accompanied the recent increase in Catholic libraries, did not seem always to extend to the practice of annual inventories. Many Catholic libraries preferred, as they still prefer, to stick to round-number guesses. Moreover, some of the Catholic libraries, the larger as well as the smaller, failed to make returns for the occasional reports of the U. S. Bureau of Education, our chief source of statistical information. Hence, the reader is warned that the following estimates of Catholic library growth have in them even a larger amount of conjecture than what has already been ventured on American libraries in general.

---

[1] *Public Libraries in the United States*, 1876, p. 158.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 144.

Eva M. Perry reckoned from various sources that in 1908 there were about 120 Catholic school libraries each claiming more than 5,000 volumes, with a total of a little more than 2,000,000 volumes; and that in twenty years the number of these libraries had doubled, and their total number of volumes had also doubled.[1] William Stetson Merrill, in 1922, estimated the number of Catholic libraries with more than 5,000 volumes as 178, with a total of 2,949,052 volumes.[2] Since some of the individual reports given him are known to contain grossly exaggerated or very vague figures, one must not be misled by the apparent definiteness of his total findings into accepting them as particularly accurate. Thus, some one reported to Mr. Merrill 110,000 volumes for the library of Loyola University, Chicago, when a generous estimate for all the libraries of the University would have been about 43,000 volumes.[3] St. Benedict's Abbey, Atchison, Kansas, reported "between 30,000 and 40,000 volumes."[4] But his total of approximately 3,000,000 volumes in all fits in fairly well with Miss Perry's estimates of 2,000,000 for 1908 and 4,000,000 for 1929.

Another approach to at least some rough idea of the growth of Catholic libraries is offered by the statistics for the number of secondary and higher Catholic schools. In 1890 there were 772 of these schools.[5] By 1922, the number had grown to 2,166, according to Mr. Merrill;[6] by 1930, it had grown to 2,516, according to the National Catholic Welfare Conference Department of Education.[7] The really striking part of that increase is in secondary schools, from about 700 in 1890 to nearly 2,200 in 1930, a threefold growth. More schools obviously means more libraries; but we still know nothing about the size of the libraries.

[1] *Catholic School Libraries*, an unpublished Master's Thesis, Loyola University, Chicago, 1933.

[2] *Catholic Builders of the Nation*, IV, 328.

[3] *Catholic Builders of the Nation*, IV, 339.

[4] *Ibid.* IV, 341.

[5] *Sadlier's Catholic Directory*, New York, 1891, pp. 412-413.

[6] *Catholic Builders of the Nation*, IV, 328.

[7] *Directory of Catholic Colleges and Schools.* Washington, 1932, p. 10.

Fragmentary data about a few of the larger libraries indicate, however, that there has been considerable growth in size as well as in numbers of Catholic libraries. Miss Perry, partly from printed sources, partly through correspondence with librarians, has gathered some figures showing this growth, of which the following are samples:

Georgetown: from 85,000 volumes in 1902 to 164,547 in 1932
Notre Dame: from 60,000 volumes in 1902 to 137,068 in 1929
St. Louis: from 41,500 volumes in 1902 to 134,633 in 1929
Catholic U.: from 136,853 volumes in 1922 to 294,716 in 1929.

These figures, together with some of the earlier statistics to be found in Appendix II, serve merely as illustrations, and lead to no more definite conclusion than the suggestion that some similar increase in size may be expected in other libraries.

The most far-reaching attempts to collect data on Catholic libraries are made by the U. S. Office of Education. In the latest publication at hand, for 1929, there are listed 412 Catholic libraries reporting more than 3,000 volumes each. The total number of books for these 412 libraries adds up to 5,399,453; and they are cared for by 736 librarians.[1] These figures leave us in the dark for information concerning more than 2,000 Catholic libraries, some of which, such as Georgetown, Marquette University, Loyola University of Chicago, apparently turned in no report at all. Moreover, 194 of the 412 libraries listed, nearly one-half, report in vague round-numbers, not calculated to inspire confidence in their accuracy. We are told that there were 4,508 libraries of all sorts reporting between 1,000 and 3,000 volumes. How many of those were smaller Catholic libraries? How many volumes did they have? How many librarians? Nothing but wild guesses can be hazarded as answers to these questions.

If, by a largely conjectural estimate, we set down the total number of Catholic libraries, parish, society, rental, and school libraries as in the neighborhood of 3,000, and their total holdings as about 8,000,000 volumes or slightly less, we are not likely to be far out. And if we compare these figures with the general estimate for all the libraries of the country, and recall that whilst the Catholics of the United States increased their numbers to one-sixth of the total population, they were able to enlarge their library holding only to one-twentieth of the total for the country, we shall, perhaps, have about as good an idea as we can get of the growth of Catholic libraries.

---

[1] Figures compiled by Gregory J. Mann from *Statistics of Public, Society and School Libraries, 1929.* U. S. Office of Educ. Bull. 37, 1930.

4. THE PLACE OF LIBRARIES IN CATHOLIC EDUCATION

Teachers, as a rule, are peaceful folk; but educationists are often very contentious. They have theories; and one good, violent educational theory is the equivalent of a whole orchard of apples of discord. Their theories have had a lot to do with the position of libraries in school education. Fortunately, these paragraphs are concerned with only a brief account of some influences of educational theories upon the place of libraries in Catholic schools, not with the validity of the theories themselves.

About the close of the nineteenth century, the "scientific" trend in school education, which had been developing from the days of Francis Bacon, began to make itself forcibly felt in America. Largely through the militancy of such men as Charles Eliot of Harvard, it issued in a rapidly spreading movement to expand school curricula, an expansion which was usually spoken of as "enrichment," according to the well-known American synonymity of "bigger and better." This led to two important changes in school procedure; and these in turn powerfully affected the work of libraries in the schools. It does sound rather like the House that Jack Built; but that is the round-about way in which educational theories shaped the future of American school libraries.

Let us look at the two changes in school procedure which were the immediate influences affecting the libraries. The first of these procedures was that students, in colleges and even in secondary schools, were offered a wide latitude of subjects amongst which they might choose what they preferred, in place of the old schedule of subjects organized for them by the faculty. The move at once met with a large welcome. It looked like a "democratic" procedure, in a country where "democracy," even when not at all understood, was enthusiastically acclaimed. It flattered the students by assuming that they were intellectually and morally capable of making a wise choice amongst the enormous variety of subjects open to them.[1]

The second change was in the approach of teachers to their task. With a constantly shifting body of students, wandering from one course of lectures to another, the old personal relation of teacher to student was no longer possible. The teacher concentrated upon his subject rather than upon his pupils. He became a specialist, delving in his allotted corner of the curriculum, a man of whom it was said that he "knew more and more of less and less." In the proper sense of the word, he seldom taught; instead, he lectured. His primary aim was to offer information; his standing was measured at least as much by the quantity of information he offered as by its quality.

That these two methods, electivism and specialist teaching, should lead to increased reading assignments for the students, was inevitable. The lecturers demanded larger library facilities, and strove to send their students to a more extensive use of books and periodicals. The library began to be considered the most important of the student's laboratories, his chief workshop at school.[2] What effect this had upon his love of reading, is a question that does not concern us here.

These changes in school procedure, with their immediate consequences for school libraries, were begun and carried on, at first, in non-Catholic schools. In the 1899 Report of the U. S. Commissioner of Education, three-fourths of the 422 colleges reporting to his office had adopted the elective system. Of the 40 Catholic colleges included in the total of 422, only three permitted their students any notable choice of subjects. With the Catholic colleges forming nearly forty percent of the schools adhering to the older type of curriculum, it was natural that Catholics should be prominent amongst those who assailed the new methods, and scornfully called the elective system "cafeteria education"; although it would be a grave mistake to conclude that they were the only critics, or that they were unanimous in their criticism.[1]

---

[1] The U. S. Office of Education, *Biennial Survey, 1926-1928*, p. 963, reported enrollment of high-school students in 250 subjects. The number of subjects in colleges and universities was still larger.

[2] Amongst hundreds of similar articles, see Rowland Haynes, "Relation of Books and Libraries to Education from the Point of View of College and Adult Education," in *Bulletin of the American Library Association*, August, 1938. 32:508-511.

But the pressure of an atmosphere of general favor toward the new methods gradually broke down opposition. That apologetic timidity which disposes many Catholics to imitate the practices of the non-Catholic schools, led school after school to adopt, quietly, unobtrusively, details of the new methods: elaboration of curriculum, departmental organization, specialist lecturing. In time, these practices were defended, occasionally with ardor. Little by little, their implications for the position of the library in the school began to be more openly recognized. Catholic schools began to apologize for their libraries, as twenty years before they had apologized for their courses of studies.

What is the present attitude of Catholic teachers and librarians toward the increased importance of the school library? If we attempt to analyze that attitude, we find that Catholic teachers and librarians fall into three groups. The first group, made up of enthusiasts for more and larger libraries, who place the library first amongst the agencies of school education, is not a large group; but it is vocal and aggressive. The second group, inclined to be skeptical or even hostile to the new emphasis upon the library, probably numbers more members than the first; but they are not as vigorous in expressing themselves, they recognize that their stand is out of line with general library enthusiasm, they shrink from being considered merely old-fogyish or reactionary.[2] The third group, overwhelmingly the largest, includes the peaceful, good souls, who drift along with such share of modern practices as their schools have drifted into accepting, who shrug their shoulders over the contentions of the first two groups, and make no pretence at charting a definite course for themselves.

---

[1] A very vigorous early critic of electivism was Timothy Brosnahan, S.J. (1856-1915), who wrote a number of pamphlets and magazine articles on the question. Of secular opponents of the system, a good example is W. J. S. Bryan, "To What Extent Should a Pupil in the High School be Allowed to Choose his Studies?" in *National Educational Association Journal*, 1900, pp. 428-437. In the same year, James A. Burns, C.S.C., wrote a mild defense of electivism in colleges, "The Elective System of Studies," *The Catholic World*, June, 1900. 71:366-375.

[2] For an excellent expression of this point of view, see Alfred Schnepp, S.M., "One Way to Educational Leadership," in *The Catholic World*, 97:650-658 (Sept., 1938), especially pp. 652-653.

They are in a placid, unworried state of fairly complete bewilderment.

From such a confused attitude toward the pre-eminence of the school library, the natural result is wide variety and wide uncertainty in assigning to the library its place in Catholic education. On the one hand, the more aggressive proponents of more reading assignments, more special reserves, larger reading rooms, larger appropriations for books and periodicals, more librarians, more degrees for librarians, more prestige for librarians, more control of the students' reading by librarians, are strident and compelling, and insist that the rank-and-file are very unprogressive (a devastating word in the United States) unless they work for the aggrandizement of the library.[1] On the other hand, the traditional Catholic mistrust of educational methods that assume too much in the student, that put the book in a higher place than the teacher, even when it is not particularly articulate, is silently effective to dampen enthusiasm for greatly enlarged libraries and library services. Add to this the poverty which in general characterizes Catholic schools, and one can readily understand why the magnification of libraries and librarians has proceeded at a relatively slow and jerky pace in Catholic schools.

5. Catholic Librarians

A primary difficulty in attempting even a rough estimate of the number of Catholic librarians in the United States comes from our uncertainty in defining what a librarian is. One Catholic librarian, in public pronouncements, came perilously near to asserting that professionally he stood alone in the United States. Avoiding such a distressingly extreme limit as that, shall we consider as librarians all the individuals who, in their spare moments, lovingly dust the little handful of books to be found in even the tiniest parish school or orphanage? In that case, there must be reckoned for this country, according to the figures in the *Official Catholic Directory* for 1938, at least 10,803 Catholic librarians. If we restrict the classification to those persons who have administrative charge of a library containing a thousand or more books, and who attempt some loan and reference service with those books, we may venture a conservative estimate of perhaps 4,000 Catholic librarians.

---

[1] The last ten years have witnessed an intensification of pleas for the library in Catholic schools. Although these efforts were at first directed chiefly toward improvement and enlargement of the library in the colleges, they soon moved over to the field of the lower schools. For high schools, see Francis E. Fitzgerald, "Standards for Catholic High School Libraries," in *Nat. Cath. Educ. Ass'n. Bulletin,* Nov., 1929. 26: 296-303. For parish schools, see Paul E. Campbell, "The Elementary School Library," in *The Homiletic and Pastoral Review,* July, Aug., 1930. 30: 1077-1083; 1159-1166.

What sort of persons are those 4,000 librarians? By sex, they are probably ninety-eight percent female. By ecclesiastical status, they are probably ninety percent members of religious orders. It is likely that seventy to eighty percent of them are part-time librarians, in many cases their librarianship taking up only a minor part of their time. In the larger parish schools and the smaller high schools, the superior is most often in charge of the finances and the book selection of the library, with perhaps a teacher-assistant to look after cataloguing, loans and reference. Occasionally, a secular librarian is to be met with in the high school libraries. The few male librarians are found chiefly in the college and university libraries.

One of the first things to be noted about practically all these Catholic librarians is that their authority in the library is much less than that of librarians in public libraries or in most of the non-Catholic libraries. There is a common tendency in Catholic religious communities for the superior to keep his or her hand close to every detail of the work of the community, a nervous reluctance to delegate authority, above all in any matters involving expenditure of money. Comparatively few Catholic librarians have a definite budget assigned for their libraries. Often they must refer even trifling purchases of supplies to the direct ruling of the head of the school. The utmost initiative they are supposed to display is limited to offering suggestions to the superior. That limitation of authority varies a good deal between one library and another, because it is often founded rather upon the "personal equation" of the superior than upon the rules of the religious institute.

The technical training of Catholic librarians, just like that of all other librarians, and just like that of teachers, shows a wide range of degrees of thoroughness and excellence. In the larger Catholic libraries, where library techniques are necessarily more elaborated, the librarians are usually skilled and experienced persons. In the smaller libraries, the demand for technical equipment in the librarian is less, and in consequence the equipment itself is less. There are, of course, occasional exceptions to both of these statements.

The problem of technical training for Catholic librarians has been much discussed, especially in the past ten or twelve years. Later in this book, we shall review some of the opinions as to what that training should be, how much and of what kind, and where and how it should be acquired. But for the moment, to offer another rough estimate in keeping with those already ventured, it may be enough to say that the general level of technical training is probably much lower amongst Catholic librarians than amongst non-Catholic librarians.

Finally, Catholic librarians have been aware, as all modern librarians are, of the value of library associations. A considerable number, perhaps as high as fifteen or twenty percent, of Catholic librarians are members of one or more of the hundred library organizations now existing in the United States. The general relations between Catholic and non-Catholic librarians are friendly, in spite of the mutually accepted classification of Catholic librarians as an inferior group. But library associations present another Catholic library problem, which must be taken up later.

This crude sketch of the general condition and position of Catholic libraries in the United States does not pretend to any completeness. The purpose in offering it is no more than to summarize a few of the salient facts about Catholic libraries as a preparation for considering a little more in detail some of the particular problems that confront those libraries.

CHAPTER III

PROBLEMS OF LIBRARY ADMINISTRATION

Library administration includes in its scope the ordering and management of all the functions of a library. Hence, problems of administration are, in one sense, simply the lump sum of all the detailed problems of the library. But there are certain aspects of library administration which may be said to antedate the details of the working of a library. These concern the broad planning or manner of organizing the library, and they offer problems which are quite independent of the difficulties that may arise in any particular function of the library. In fact, many of the individual difficulties of library work have their source in bad original planning or in lack of planning. That is why this chapter is devoted to a separate consideration of some problems of library administration.

1. The Character and Aims of the Library

By every law of logic, the very first thing to be settled about a library should be its specific character and aims. These, in a library, are equivalent to objectives in a scheme of education. They are the first directives, the foundations of guidance for all individual efforts. To say that the general purpose of gathering books together and arranging them so that they can be put into the hands of readers is all that is needed as a basis for library work is just as unpractical as to make the general notion of education the sole guide in planning the work of a particular school. Yet one may reasonably suspect that many libraries, and many schools, have floundered along upon such vague generalities as that.

In the published historical sketches of many libraries it is instructive to note how long they were in existence and how large they had become before any serious effort was made to shape the definite aims guiding the specific work of the library. Most of the public libraries of the United States just grew and grew, added books, expanded services, multiplied departments and branches, as appropriations and occasions offered. Their policy was vaguely inclusive of any and every kind of library function. Their only practical limitations were financial.

Part of that sprawling inclusiveness came from the fact that so many of those libraries were political creations, dependent upon the taxing agencies of, usually, a municipal government, and hence sharing the common urge toward unplanned expansion which has been notable in most modern agencies of government. Part of it was due to the undifferentiated mass of patrons that the public libraries had to try to serve. Part of it came from the combination of "apostleship of the book" and trade unionism which has stamped itself upon a great deal of public librarianship in the United States.

Some of the privately endowed public libraries showed more discrimination in their aims. They came into existence after library work in the United States had begun to be more definitely organized than it had been in the first hundred years of the nation. They had the benefit of the long experience of other libraries, even of the mistakes of other libraries. They began with more definite resources than many of the earlier libraries. And, by no means least of all their advantages, they had good librarians in charge of them. As a result of all these circumstances, their character and purposes were sharply defined, if not from the outset, at least early enough to map out the lines of their future development.

Three outstanding instances of this sound library planning are offered in the Newberry Library, the Crerar Library, and the Huntington Library, the first two in Chicago, the third in San Marino, California. The Newberry Library was founded in 1887, with William F. Poole as its first librarian. Seven years later, the John Crerar Library was established. Both libraries were definitely begun as reference libraries, without loan service. The trustees of the two institutions, guided by sensible advice from their librarians, got together upon an agreement to limit their respective fields. The Crerar Library confined itself to technology and the natural sciences, the Newberry to the humanities. I believe the two libraries even made an interchange of such parts of their already large collections of books as fitted in with the divided fields.

The Henry E. Huntington Library was begun as the private library of a very rich man. Before his death in 1927 he had made arrangements to turn it into a public reference library. His wealth had made it possible to select practically any kind of books he wished; the advice of his librarians had led him to concentrate upon incunabula and books and manuscripts touching upon American and English history and literature. The trustees and librarians of the Huntington Library have wisely kept to those limitations. These facts go far toward explaining why these three libraries are amongst the most useful and scholarly that we have in this country.

In the matter of definite aims, school libraries might seem to have a secure advantage over public libraries. They serve a distinct and fairly homogeneous class of patrons. They have guiding lights set for them by the course of studies in the school. In theory, it should be rather easy to plan the character of a school library. But in point of fact, the courses of studies have become wandering lights, multitudinous will-o-the-wisps, so numerous and so scattered as to afford no positive direction at all to the librarian. The demands upon the school library have in consequence multiplied, and have called for an increasing and changing variety of library services. It is difficult to see much difference in vague inclusiveness between many of the college and university libraries and the most expansive of the public libraries.

As an historical fact, the element of planned aims has not been very prominent in the general run of American libraries. In this regard they have developed in a manner parallel to the whole school development in the United States, in which planning seems to have kept several steps in the rear of growth, a groping corrective rather than an assured guidance. There are exceptions to this general rule; but not enough of them to affect the common character of American school libraries.

When the Catholic school libraries began to grow, they had at first the help toward planning offered by pretty well defined courses of studies. But in the past thirty years, the period in which their most significant growth has taken place, they began rapidly to lose that help, because their schools began to imitate the wild experimentation in elective studies which had already become characteristic of the non-Catholic schools. It was inevitable that the Catholic school library should show the effects of that imitation in its own scrambling growth.

Catholic librarians were not leaders, in a position to propose a clear program of library work. Their position was one of inferiority in two most important ways. They were inferior in their relative standing in the world of libraries, looked down upon by other librarians for their poverty of resources, and perhaps even more for their poverty of technical equipment. They were inferior in their own school system, because they had little or nothing to say about the character or aims of the libraries in which they worked. They had little prestige, and less influence, at home or abroad. They were cowed by the impressive wealth and technical assurance of non-Catholic libraries, and they were very small potatoes in their own libraries. Hence it would be most unfair to put upon them all the blame for their feebleness in this fundamental business of library administration.

To be quite frank, this first problem of Catholic library administration can scarcely ever be solved, nor is it likely in the future to be solved, by the librarians alone. In school libraries, the most numerous and important of the Catholic libraries, the aims of the library must be determined by the policy of the school with regard both to the course of studies and to the teaching methods in actual use. In these matters, the librarian is a follower, not a leader. It is a very rare case where he has any voice at all in establishing the school policy, upon which, even in the best of circumstances, he must base the aims of the library. Fortunately, this book does not have to enter into the extremely knotty question of Catholic school policy, before which even the Catholic educationists seem to be almost as helpless as the Catholic librarians, individually and collectively. All too often, the Catholic librarian has no course open to him except that of patiently continuing to putter along in a school that does not quite know its own mind, that is torn by divergent imitations of non-Catholic schools, and must scheme, with as good a sense of humor as he can command, to fit the details of his library work to whatever school program is for the moment presented to him.

Occasionally, however, the librarian does have a chance to decide upon the character and aims of his library. To plan intelligently, he must take into account at least these three factors in his problem: 1. the sort of persons who are to use the library; 2. the particular services they want from the library; 3. the resources at his disposal to meet their demands. These are a minimum. Many would add, no doubt, that the librarian should also plan for what his patrons do not want, but should want; that he should be no servile caterer to reader tastes, but should train and elevate reader tastes to nobler levels. On the generous supposition that we have enough librarians capable of any such effort, there are instances in which that educational ideal is properly part of the library aims to be settled upon by the librarian. Perhaps in public libraries there is always some place for that ideal. But school libraries are decidedly not called upon to deal with it, for the obvious reason that such an educational ideal is professedly under the care of the teaching staff, who usually outnumber the librarians twenty or thirty to one. If in a school the teachers cannot influence reader taste, it is hopeless to pass the task back to the burdened librarian.

To stick to the three minimum considerations, here is an illustration of how they might be applied. Some years ago, a Catholic Sister was authorized to start a library in the hospital in which she served. She took some college courses in library techniques. She began gathering some money for initial equipment of the library and a first stock of books. But she had only the vaguest notion of what she wished or expected her hospital library to be or to do. It was suggested that she try to formulate answers to some such questions as these:

Was it to be primarily a library for the hospital staff, doctors, sisters, nurses, or for the patients? If for all of these, was it to be organized as a unit library or in distinct departments? Was it to furnish chiefly recreational reading matter, or to be educational, or religious, in character? If all three, what proportion was to be kept amongst them? What means were to be used for a continuance of funds for maintenance, service, and growth of the library? Was the hospital to allot a budget from its general income? Was the library to be run on a rental basis, supported by small contributions from its patrons? Finally, an added but important point for a hospital, what precautions were to be taken that books circulated amongst patients would not be carriers of infection?

To leave such questions as these unanswered was to make certain of getting a very poor library. It might not be possible to answer them all at once, before setting out in the actual work of the library; but they could not be ignored except at the price of dooming the library to ineffectiveness, and probably to a short life.

2. The Position of the Catholic Librarian

Given some sort of solution to this first problem of library administration, or even in the fumbling lack of a solution, the librarian's next problem is to discover, if possible, what is his real position in the library. He cannot take up the details of his work with any security until he knows in clear terms what jurisdiction he has, what are the limits of his authority and his responsibility. His authority may be much or may be little; but he should endeavor to see that it be definite.

In Catholic libraries, the place of the librarian has not always been defined; it has often been left so uncertain and indeterminate that the librarian was afraid to move at all, and became little more than the timid guardian of the books. Most of the Catholic librarians in the United States are members of religious communities. They work under a traditional reluctance on the part of their superiors to delegate authority, a reluctance that seems to be more evident amongst the women religious than amongst the men, and that may be based upon the religious rule itself, or may be only vaguely customary, or may have no other foundation than the personal attitude of the superiors.

So far as the general fixed rules or ordinances are concerned, it would be an excellent thing for some one to study the rules of Catholic teaching orders and congregations, with a view to discover what provision they make for defining the place and work of librarians. It is possible that that provision is often both more clearly set forth and more generous than the usual practice of Catholic schools might lead one to suppose. It is also possible that even the librarians themselves have not fully grasped the extent to which their religious institute supports and guides them in their work. We cannot undertake such a study here. But as an illustration of what it might mean, we offer a thumbnail sketch of the Jesuit rules for the librarian.

These rules, very brief, were first drawn up by the general superior, Francis Borgia, in 1567, were increased in number to twelve by Everard Mercurian in 1580, and were published again, unchanged, by Claude Acquaviva in 1582. They were much concerned with prudential restrictions, about the kind of books to be put in the library and about loans of books. The librarian was ordered to classify the books, and to make a catalogue of them by classes, with the authors listed alphabetically under each class. Apparently he had no authority to buy books, but was only to advise the superior about books which might be bought.

These rules stood unchanged for three hundred and fifty years.[1] In 1932 they were revised, and were expanded to nearly double the old number. The revised rules start out by setting the librarian in the same position under the superior as the prefect of studies, or, as he is called in modern parlance, the dean of a college or principal of a high school. They call for a library budget to be assigned by the superior. They strengthen the hand of the librarian against teacher demand in book selection. They advocate a limited use of "open shelves." They insist upon records, accession records, gift records, loan records. They head off impulsive changes in the system of classification. They call for two catalogues, one a dictionary catalogue, the other a classed catalogue or at least a shelf-list. And they order the librarian to study librarianship.

As a foundation scheme for library administration, most librarians would acknowledge these rules to be thoroughly admirable. They outline unmistakably the position and the function of the librarian. They give him general directions about his work, and a few wise limitations, and then leave the details to his judgment and skill. It is worth noting, moreover, that even before the revised rules established the place of the librarian and legislated for a budget, a number of Jesuit superiors had foreseen the need of at least those two points of administrative definition, and had determined the jurisdiction of the librarian and had set up a library budget. The revision of the rules was based upon a practice already pretty widely accepted. For the benefit of those who may be interested to look more closely into this specimen of religious rules for a librarian, the two versions of the rules are given in Appendix III.

---

[1] Antonio M. Arregui, S.J. *Annotationes ad Epitomen Institui Societatis Jesu.* Romae, 1934, pp. 769-770. Augustus Coemans, S.J., notes that the rules of St. Francis Borgia were seven in number, increased to twelve by Everard Mercurian. *Breves Notitiae de Instituti, Historia, Bibliographia Societatis.* Bruxellis, 1937, p. 42.

Catholic librarians not under the immediate control of religious communities must thresh out with the trustees or the executive heads of their institution the question of their position and authority. Generally speaking, they are likely to have less difficulty in reaching a definition than have the religious librarians. They will have still less difficulty when, in addition to the help now given them in this problem by the example of non-Catholic libraries, they have the backing of a more general adoption of sensible practice by the religious communities.

3. The Library Budget

It is bad enough to have to grope in planning the work of the library; but it is nothing less than baffling to attempt to carry on library services without any assurance of financial resources. The hit-or-miss method of figuring out some library detail and then trying to wangle funds to put it into execution is always wasteful of effort, and usually in the end wasteful of money. A small but definite budget offers a better working condition than a possibly larger, but uncertain and haphazard, sum of money for the library. The definiteness is really more important than the amount.

With a library budget, even a tiny one, the librarian knows where he stands, and what he can do, and what he cannot do; his authority is implemented. Knowing what library services can be covered by the funds at his disposal, he can weigh the proportionate value of those services against the sums to be expended, and in so far put some intelligence into his plans for the library. Even his financial limitations help him in planning. This or that function, theoretically desirable, is practically impossible for lack of money. It can be put aside, with no matter what regrets, and leave the road clear for whatever achievements are really within his reach.

The principle of allotting a definite sum for the library has been accepted by practically all non-Catholic libraries. The only question for them to settle is the quantitative measure of the library budget. For a time, the "standardizing agencies," for schools of various levels, inclined toward the notion of fixing a minimum per capita sum as the measure of school expenditure on the library. For instance, in 1923, The North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, besides requiring at least 8,000 volumes as content of a college library, demanded a minimum annual expenditure of five dollars per student for the maintenance of the library. For junior college libraries, with a minimum book collection of 3,000 volumes, the yearly appropriation for books and periodicals was set at $800.00; and no measure was offered for sums to be allotted for salaries and maintenance.[1] Ten years later, the definite minimum estimates were dropped, and the Accrediting Committee contented itself with requiring for its accredited schools that "expenditures for library books should be sufficient to cover needed replacements of and additions to the book stock"[2] and that library salaries be sufficient to secure competent service.[3] The change from a fixed sum to a principle as measure of the library budget is intelligent; but it throws the question of the budget back upon the larger question of the character and aims of the library, and it opens the way to weaseling.

The National Catholic Educational Association has been chary of assigning exact figures for the library budget amongst its requirements for accredited colleges and high schools. Its attitude is reflected in this statement of library standards for colleges proposed by the Accreditation Committee in 1935:

"The library is adequate for the educational service which it is attempting to render in the number of books, of periodicals, in the housing of the books, the physical condition of the reading room, the quality and extent of library service, and in the guarantee in the genuine budget of maintaining the adequacy of the addition."[1]

---

[1] *N. C. A. Proceedings*, 1924, pp. 11, 14.

[2] *N. C. A. Manual of Accrediting Procedures.* Nov., 1934, p. 46.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 47.

The rather curious English does not succeed in entirely obscuring the general meaning of this statement, and leaves clear enough the hint of a suspicion that Catholic library budgets are sometimes more nominal than real.

It is impossible to make any close estimate of the extent to which Catholic school libraries meet these suggestions and requirements of the educational associations. Some libraries more than fulfill the minimum demands of the North Central Association; some fall short. Some have "genuine" budgets; some have only paper budgets. How many Catholic libraries there are in each class, we have no way of knowing. But there are indications that the value of the library budget is being more and more appreciated by Catholic school heads, and that the practice of budgetting is being more widely adopted.

4. The Library Routines

There are a number of procedures in library work that are accepted practically everywhere in the United States as necessary to the sound functioning of a library. It is hard to see how any one can question the need for, say, book selection and book buying, for accession records, for classifying and cataloguing books. They are the essential processes of getting books into the library, identifying them with a minimum of effort, assigning them an orderly location, and introducing them to the readers.

Then, in most libraries, a procedure must be set up to facilitate the loan of books, and the return of borrowed books. Here there are major and minor variations of procedure: in the question of access to books, open or closed shelves; in the setting up of reserved book collections for quick turnover of loans; in time limits; in limitations of borrowing rare books or unsuitable books. Some reference work must be arranged for in every library, and some bibliographic work; how much or how little is another problem of library administration.

Then, there are procedures to be found only in some libraries, involving the management of special collections, the

[1] *N. C. E. A. Bulletin,* Vol. 32, p. 84.

establishing of departmental libraries, the supervision of separate reading rooms and seminar rooms, the organization of documents, manuscripts, archival material, the operation of a book bindery, of a photostating apparatus, sometimes of a museum or art gallery or recital hall or children's room. With these, as rather out of the ordinary, we have no concern here.

As regards the common library procedures, an early administrative problem for the librarian is to organize them for efficient working in the particular circumstances of his library. It is evident at once that this problem will present itself differently in different libraries. There is no model solution to be followed mechanically; but each librarian must study the actual situation in his own library, and order the routines of his library procedures in such a way as to avoid waste motions and get the best results out of his time and resources.

This is a problem which seems to stump many Catholic libraries. Their failure to solve it is the source of some of their most appalling deficiencies. Apparently some of the Catholic librarians do not even know what the common library procedures are; although it must be said that instances of such crass ignorance are becoming more rare. More evident is the fact that some other Catholic librarians, although aware of the ordinary techniques of library work, and sometimes even able to talk glibly about them, in reality have little or no understanding of their meaning and purpose. One fairly large Catholic college library, under a very vocal Catholic librarian, had for eight years as many as four sets of conflicting accession numbers in its books. Plenty of Catholic libraries have no accession records at all. Many are not classified or catalogued, and their librarians appear never to have heard of a shelf list. It is true that often the librarian knows what should be done, but has not the time or the help to do it. But, whatever be the explanation, the fact remains that a great weakness of Catholic libraries is manifest in this business of good arrangement and faithful performance of the library routines.

One explanation commonly offered for that weakness in Catholic library work is that the librarians lack technical training; and the remedy most often proposed is to send the librarian through a library school. In another place we must discuss the problem of training Catholic librarians. For the present let it be said that the training given in a library school will not of itself secure intelligent administration of the library routines. Some extremely incompetent practitioners of library procedures hold degrees from library schools. Experience in library work seems to be as necessary as school training; and the native ability to profit by both training and experience is the most absolute requisite of all.

Not long ago, a young woman, graduate of an accredited library school, with seven years of experience in a large municipal library, in which she had risen to the position of chief classifier, was taking a busman's holiday by visiting other libraries during her vacation. She came to a relatively small college library, its seventy thousand volumes comfortably housed in its own building, its modest range of services carried on with fair efficiency by a staff of four librarians and four student assistants. She was courteously shown over the library. When she came to the cataloguing room, she asked how many cataloguers worked there. She was told there were two, and that on occasion they had to help in loan and reference work. She asked: "And of course you have a classifier besides?" No, she was told, each cataloguer was also a classifier. She was astounded. She could not conceive of a staff, no matter how small, without the full hierarchy of her own library; she had no practical idea of the difference in handling library routines in a small library and in a very large library.

It would be absurd to deny the value of library training and experience. Yet how many librarians whose experience, like this young woman's, has been in large libraries, where the routines are necessarily organized in minute subdivision almost as in a huge manufacturing plant, are technically equipped to undertake the administration of a small library, where they must handle alone the common procedures of library service? A librarian with a half dozen years' experience as say, book-buyer for the branches of a municipal public library, might show by actual test a capacity for library administration rather comparable to the engineering skill of the mechanic who for two years in an automobile assembly plant "screwed on nut 42."

It seems the most elementary matter of common sense, indeed almost distressingly obvious, that the library routines must be organized differently in a little high school library with one librarian in charge, in a college library with from two to five or six librarians, and in a large university or public library with a staff of from a dozen to fifty or more librarians. Each of these types of library, differing as they do in size, in aims, in range of services, in personnel, in resources, will offer a distinct administrative problem. There are principles of library administration applicable to all of them. But the art of librarianship, like all other arts, consists in the skill to apply common principles to individual situations; and it is the art of librarianship, based upon whatever training and experience the librarian may command, that ultimately makes or mars a library.

It is impossible to illustrate fully in such a book as this the flexibility called for in intelligent ordering of library routines. But we must look at a few sample instances. For example, in a library conducted by three librarians, the addition of one new assistant, or the introduction of one new service, will call for a complete shuffle of the routines of library work. Change of emphasis upon details of library work means a reorganization of the routines. One librarian inherited a book collection of some thirty-five thousand volumes, inadequately accessioned, haphazardly classified, less than one-tenth catalogued. He was not able to enlarge his library staff. His administration, therefore, called for an intensive concentration upon those deficiencies for several years. When that mess had been cleared up, he could turn to improving other services of the library. That involved another rerouting of the library procedures, a new orientation of the routines of work. Suppose a library conducted on the system of free access to the stacks closes its stacks. Immediately the organization of the library staff may have to be changed, the personnel of the loan service redirected.

These instances concern shifts in routines; but they may serve to illustrate the interdependence of routines, and to hint at the necessity for getting their relations properly arranged. Good administration demands, first, a sensible selection of services within the compass of the librarian's resources; and second, a skilled dovetailing of procedures so that there is neither gap nor overlapping in the work of the library. Irritating errors in the library catalogue, for example, come as often from a poorly ordered routine of work as from incompetence on the part of the cataloguers. It is easy to miss steps when the steps are badly arranged. Incidentally, good routines mean economy of time, and therefore of money. In one library, a common-sense re-arrangement of the steps in handling books through the cataloguing room cut in half the cost of classifying, cataloguing, and marking books.

But this is one of the library problems which no book can solve. The best that even a better book than this could do is to call the problem to the attention of Catholic librarians. Perhaps the most practical aid toward solving it will be found in observing the ways in which other libraries try to meet it, with a view to profiting by their successes and failures.

5. Administrative Relations in a School Library

The school library is a cog in a machine, an organ of an educational body, a common tool of teachers and students, or any one of a dozen metaphors that convey the idea that it is not an independent entity, that the reasons for its existence and the manner of its functioning are bound up with the life of the school as a whole. That implies the necessity of co-ordinating the work of the library with the work of the school. That means, in turn, that the librarian must handle with intelligence and skill the relations between himself and the executive and teaching faculty of the school.

The librarian should have authority; he cannot do his work without it; but he is an ass if he tries to make his authority regal and absolutely independent. The administrative problem here is to keep a nice balance between ignoring the faculty and taking dictation from the faculty. Any librarian can tell you that there are times and occasions when this is quite a job.

The problem crops up in various ways. In book selection, how is the librarian to meet real needs of the teachers, yet resist idle whims of the teachers? A teacher has been known to insist, almost raucously, that certain expensive books be purchased by the library, and then neglect completely either to use the books himself or to send his students to them. In loan service, how is the librarian to satisfy several teachers who want the same books on separate reserves, with different time-limits for their use by the students? How is he to handle the kind teacher who tries to have the library stock up with text-books in order to save his students the bother and expense of buying them? How is he to deal with criticism of the library management by teachers who for years at a time do not put foot in the library? Some years ago, a college teacher, at a session of the Catholic Library Association, expatiated for over an hour on the abominable way in which librarians ignore the needs of the teachers. The records showed that this teacher, for the preceding four years, had entered his school library just once a year, to ask gruffly for some material to be used in a debate under his supervision.

One answer to the problem is that the librarian must have a sense of humor. Sometimes he must have enough sense of humor to serve for himself and for the teachers as well. But there are a few general suggestions which may be offered here as a further help with this problem.

In the first place, the librarian, with his authority reasonably defined, should be careful never to overstep its limits. He should make regular reports to the executive head of the school on the condition and functioning of the library. He should inaugurate no new services, make no large administrative change of any sort, without referring the change to the head of the school and securing authoritative approval, preferably in writing. It goes without saying that he should keep his expenditures within the amounts set by the library budget. A clear and loyal understanding with the school executive is a safeguard in his own administrative work and his strongest bulwark against unreasonable criticism.

In his dealings with the teachers he should use a wise discrimination. Some of the teachers are really experts in their field; some only think they are. The librarian should actively seek the advice and help of the experts, above all in book selection, and should be as patient as he can be with the pseudo-experts. One must admit the personal equation here, and recognize the difficulty of making the distinction; in deciding where to seek help, and when to seek shelter, the librarian's own good sense, modesty, and objectivity are very much in question.

Should the librarian have a library council to advise him? The question must be left open. It cannot be answered in the same terms for every library. A library council offers advantages:

advice in doubtful cases, the encouragement of an understanding of the problems of the library, support against adverse criticism. But it has the defects of all advisory committees: it is wasteful of time, it does not always work willingly or smoothly, it often shirks decisions, it sometimes exaggerates its own importance and is not content only to advise. In practice, some of the good results to be had from a library council can be had from informal conferences between the librarian and the competent and helpful heads of departments, specialists in particular fields of erudition.

In any case, council or no council, the librarian, whilst welcoming suggestions from every one, and eager to supplement his own little knowledge of books out of the larger learning of others, must keep the final responsibility for the management of his library in his own hands, whenever the point at issue is within the coverage of his jurisdiction. To do that, without friction or offense, calls for a lot of qualities of mind and character. If the librarian has not those qualities, so much the worse for him and for his library. Certainly no book can tell how to get them.

The Catholic librarian should be able to count upon a large store of the virtue of charity in those with whom he must deal. That is central to his religious position. In actual fact, he generally does find Christian charity abundant enough in his school to make his relations tolerable. But Catholics too sometimes honor their profession in the breach. Envy, rivalries, touchy pride, impatience, suspicion, are sand in the gears of Catholic library administration just as in all other library administration. Often they can only be endured, not cured.

These paragraphs do not pretend to treat with any completeness the administrative problems of Catholic libraries. Nothing has been said, for instance, about the problems of library discipline, of the courtesy of silence in the library, of theft and mutilation of books, of the teacher who for years keeps away from others books that he is not actually using. The few problems mentioned have been touched upon only lightly. But we cannot conclude even that superficial treatment without recalling that in meeting these and like problems the librarian should have excellent help from our long tradition of Catholic education, from the supernatural purpose that stands back of his work as librarian, from the discipline and order of the religious communities that conduct most of our schools and libraries, from the established body of principles that we inherit as Catholics, from the zeal and industry for improving our work which should characterize us. If we do not always and everywhere find that help at hand, that fact constitutes another sort of problem, one that dwarfs all the detailed problems of Catholic schools and libraries.

CHAPTER IV

PROBLEMS OF BOOK SELECTION

In the order of time, certainly the first requisite for making a library is to get some books together. That fact would seem to put the problems of book selection pretty well out in the foreground. One might be tempted to say that, however much the librarian may evade other library problems, he cannot avoid grappling in some fashion with these. They stand before him at the entrance to his empty shelves; they are a primary challenge to him; they touch his pride as a professed man of books. The value of all subsequent library services must depend, first and foremost, upon the books themselves. From the lowly beginner of a private library to the important head of the book selection department in a great public or university library, the first test of competency would seem to be this: do you know how to choose books wisely for your library?

One approach to the general problem of selecting books is to analyze it for its elementary factors, to reduce it to its simplest terms. These seem to be three: the store of books available for choosing; the book needs of the individual library; and the financial resources at the command of the librarian. There are other elements, some of them adding no little to the complexity of the problem; but these, I think, should wait consideration until a policy has been established upon the basis of the three primary factors. There are no rules for wise book selection. But there are principles to guide the librarian in selecting books; and those principles can be found in the interrelations of the available book supply and the two criteria, of library needs, and of ways and means.

In this chapter we shall deal with these three factors first, as general to any discussion of the task of selecting books; then take up some particular Catholic aspects of the problems involved. This will prepare the way for a brief consideration of some of the minor issues that come up in this part of library procedure. We must begin with a general view of the field in which choice of books is to be made.

1. The Field of Choice

Historically it is evident that library work has grown more complex, and that in each succeeding century it has called for wider erudition, and greater adroitness, in the librarian. The obvious reason for such a change in the work of librarianship is that knowledge, in the human race if not in the individual man, is cumulative, and that one of the means of transmitting knowledge, the written or printed book, has been greatly multiplied. In other words, the librarian finds his job harder, because he has to deal with more material.

Growth in book production, as we shall see later, created the problems of classification; but it first set up a condition of wealth in books which was at once the source of opportunities for book selection and the source of difficulties in selecting, the proverbial embarrassment of riches. The Greek or Roman librarian of the pre-Christian era had a rather small field of choice to cover in his search for books. The librarian of the Dark Ages was even more restricted, because of the destruction of many books in the convulsions of the dying Roman Empire. The mediaeval libraries had more books to choose from, in the resurrected copies of the older classics, and in the new manuscripts which theologians, philosophers, poets, historians, and scientists were producing.

By the time of the European invention of printing, there were perhaps fifteen thousand titles available for library choice. The first half century of printing saw this number more than doubled.[1] It is likely that the feverish publishing of printed books during the religious controversies of the Protestant Revolt again more than doubled the number of books. The seventeenth and eighteenth centuries added many more thousands of titles. The nineteenth century, with its cheapening of book production, began to turn the stream of books into a flood. When the twentieth century opened, President Eliot of Harvard warned the people of the United States that their books were piling up too fast.[2]

---

[1] *Encyclopedia Britannica,* s. v. Incunabula. XII, 147a: " . . . . total output of the 15th century presses in book form not likely to exceed 40,000 editions"; which means, perhaps, about 35,000 titles.

[2] Arthur E. Bostwick, quoting Eliot in 1904, added: "His warning has met with scant heed because experience has not brought it home to us." *Library Essays,* New York, 1920, p. 80.

He has been neither the first nor the last to repeat the ancient plaint, "of making many books there is no end,"[1] and to think that our culture is being swamped by books.

If the astounding pace of book production in recent times is a delight to the librarian because it enlarges his special world, it also brings him grief when he must pick and choose in that welter of books. His possibilities of choice, whether he recognize the fact or not, have begun to be confusing, something beyond the ordinary librarian's powers to handle. Estimates of the number of books published in the past twenty years run to as high as 150,000 titles a year. No modern librarian has ever read even "the backs of books" of all the titles issued in his own single lifetime.

If we limit our view to the United States alone, we find that of new books there were published between 1901 and 1936 the huge sum of 275,076 titles, together with 51,460 new editions of older books; and the United States ranks below England, France, and Germany in the number of books produced. The annual production in the United States rose to over 10,000 new titles in 1909. With ups and downs due to the Great War and the resulting boom and depressions, it had mounted to nearly as large a volume in 1936.[2] It must be remembered too that American libraries by no means confine their book buying to American books; that the sale, for example, of some English books in America quite equals their sale at home. Moreover, to the new books published each year must be added the accumulating older books, some of them new remainders, most of them used books. A librarian in a comparatively small library, who last year increased his book collection by 7,000 titles, estimates that to select that number of books he had to scan more than 120,000 titles.

To guide him in such a labyrinthine field of choice, the librarian has two clues, which should twist together into one: the needs of his library, and the money he is allowed to spend on books. If he cannot take hold of those, no other "aids to book selection" will be of any use to him.

---

[1] Ecclesiastes, xii, 12. For instance, an anonymous T. C. C. "Hamlet: Three Notes" in *Notes and Queries* (175:114. 13 Aug., 1938) speaks of Shakespeare's "use of oral information . . . underrated in a world like our own overcrowded with books." Shakespeare himself recognizes the complaint even though with a burlesque twist, in Jack Cade's long speech, *The Second Part of King Henry VI*, act IV, scene 7.

[2] For detailed figures, consult *The Publisher's Weekly*, or the summaries and analyses given in *The World Almanac*, 1938, p. 369.

2. The Criteria of Library Needs and Library Resources

The Library of Congress increases its book stock in at least two ways: by selection and purchase from European books, old and new; and by receiving, according to law, two copies of each book copyrighted in the United States. The second method leaves the Library no choice, destroys the possibility of book selection and all problems connected with it, and turns problems into assured disaster in so far as it puts into the library, alongside of its valuable holdings, what is probably the largest collection of book trash in the country. In accepting and servicing those enforced accessions, the Library of Congress cannot consider its needs as a library; it necessarily has to disregard quality, with which library needs are more concerned than with quantity.[1]

But all other American libraries have both the privilege and the duty of selecting all their books according to their needs, and of thinking more about the kind of books they are to add than about their number. The easiest and most obvious distinction in kinds of books offered to the librarian's choice is by subject matter. That is a sort of first quartering of the field of choice.

An analysis of the 8,584 new books published in the United States in 1936 shows that works of fiction accounted for the largest number of titles, nearly one-sixth of the total; religion (under which heading some extremely queer things are listed) was dealt with in a trifle more than half that number, or one-twelfth of the total; books on poetry and drama, on history, on biography, were nearly as many as those on religion; books about sociology and about general literature each dropped in rank to around one-twentieth of the total, books on science to about one-twenty-fifth; and philosophy (another curious assemblage) was down near the bottom, with not much more than a hundredth of the total.

A subject analysis, however, is not at all a quality analysis, in the sense of considering the excellence of the books, either in content or skill of presentation or material structure. As regards the last named quality, the general run of modern books are not as well made as some of the earlier books; the paper in them, and their binding, are both inferior. In typography they are often superior to the older books, although there are extant fifteenth century printings of Nicolas Jenson that will stand comparison with the best of modern type faces.

---

[1] Recently, efforts have been made to meet this situation in the Library of Congress, by some selective disposition of the books received under the law of copyright.

In skill of presentation, there is little fault to find with modern books. At least some measure of craftsmanship in writing has become a fairly common possession nowadays, as part of that thin diffusion of culture which ubiquitous schools tend to produce. Technical skill in writing is within the compass of the slightly educated; and the slightly educated have almost crowded out the well educated in the field of authorship.[1] It has been said that many a high school graduate could improve upon Milton's prose. Certainly we can find amongst modern books abundant instances of cleverly written balderdash.

As to the content of recent books, it is dangerous to generalize. It serves no intelligent purpose to bewail, in the fashion of *laudator temporis acti*, the degeneration of modern writers, the rapacity of modern publishers ("Now Barabbas was a publisher"), and the like sad contrasts with a wiser and nobler age. Book for book, perhaps modern writings are as compact of good, bad, and indifferent as were the older. In any case, the quality of our books reflects our common tastes and principles at least as much as it influences them. It seems to be true that a people gets the kind of books, as it gets the kind of government, that it deserves.

One generalization, however, must be risked. Recent books give the impression that they are, to a rather appalling extent, repetitive. Many of their authors seem to subsist by compiling from each other, like the fellows who get their livelihood by taking in each other's washing. A great deal even of modern scholarly writing seems to be a sort of magpie scholarship, a rearranging of borrowed bits.[1] Not merely is "the curse of the Ph.D." over a considerable part of it, but it seems to go in waves of imitation, following current vogues and popularities. It may be that our plethora of books has made us increasingly a race of absorbers. It may be that mass methods of education are turning out more and more of the mob-minded. It may also be that the publishers, who, poor fellows, must keep revolving sunflowerwise toward the sun of profits, grow invitingly along the trail of momentary fashions. Whatever the reasons, the repetitive character of a huge number of modern books is most evident to the bewildered librarian. Sometimes he is tempted to think that nowadays there is more change in titles than in the books themselves; they often appear to him a good deal like modern voters, the same fellow under a different hat.

---

[1] Writing thirty years ago, in 1908, Arthur E. Bostwick put it this way: " . . . The average of education among all persons in the community is higher, but the average among educated persons is lower, because the educated class has been enlarged by the addition of large numbers of slightly educated persons." *A Librarian's Open Shelf,* New York, 1920, p. 63. There are many who believe that the "large numbers" have since then grown larger.

In so far as he can sift out at all the real difference and the true inner qualities of the almost incredible number of books offered him, the librarian must make his choice upon a consideration of his own actual holdings and upon the genuine needs of his patrons for additional books. He has for guidance this general standard of judgment: that he should not duplicate his book collection through acquisitions that are only nominally new; that he should supplement his present books by those that will really work in with them for the benefit of those who use the library.

That is confessedly a wide rule of judging. To apply it in a practical way, the librarian must be well informed about much more than the backs of the books he already has. (One wonders at times how thoroughly conversant librarians are with the general contents of their own libraries.) He must further be equipped with enough knowledge of the courses of study in his school, and of the methods of teaching in use, to appreciate just where and how new books (new at least to the library) will be more than so much additional space-fillers on his shelves. Obviously, no library school can give him those two sorts of knowledge; he must get them in his own school and library.

At once it is evident that the general education of the librarian is here immeasurably more important than his technical training. Part of that general education should include the slowly acquired knowledge of those older books that are authoritatively established in their fields. Few librarians are erudite enough to understand how grave often is the need for those older books in their libraries. Newly published books crowd in upon them so fast that they have scant leisure for studying their library gaps in the time-tested books that should give substance and solidity to every library. Perhaps, too, the natural smug satisfaction with ourselves and ill-concealed contempt for our ancestors, which characterizes every age of humanity, has something to do with the appeal for "the latest book" on any subject. An intelligent librarian should at least have doubts as to whether or not the latest book is necessarily the best book. In many an American library, it might be excellent policy to buy ten old books for every one new book.

---

[1] In a current English play, *Running Riot*, by Leslie Henson, occur these two lines:

> "To copy out of one book is plagiarism.
> To copy out of three books is research."

But there is a second criterion which must be joined with the test of library needs, that is, the financial resources of the library, not as an absolute, but as a relative measure. With all the money in the world, it would still be bad book selection to buy stupid books, or to buy books that served no purpose in that particular library. But with the book budget limited as it always is, the librarian has to balance out his needs against his resources, with the aim of buying the most necessary books first and letting the less important wait until, if ever, he has funds for them. That seems such an obvious principle of book selection. Yet, outside of the poorest libraries, whose tiny resources for buying books hold them rigorously to this principle, it apparently is often pretty well ignored.

The enemy here is unreasonable reader demand, which naturally takes no account of the larger plans of the library, but follows its own whim, caught by the notoriety of certain books of very small library value, or swept along by curiosity to see the newest pronouncement even by men who have nothing new to say, or just enamored of the publisher's blurb. If the librarian has no more "sales resistance" than is displayed by many of the teachers and students in his school, he will squander a good deal of his book money on ephemeral or trashy books, "high-pressured" upon him by the combination of publisher's advertising and reader's itch for the *quid novi.*

This criterion of the proportionate value of the books to be selected again implies an unusual equipment in the librarian: of knowledge of books in general, knowledge of his library and its real needs, sound judgment, and firmness against irrational pressure. Common sense and experience force us to admit that librarians highly gifted with these qualities are comparatively rare. They are the qualities of a mature and educated person. As we shall see, they can, and should be supplemented by certain aids, positive and negative, in book selection; but no aids can take their place.

3. Special Catholic Aspects of Book Selection

It seems safe to say that no Catholic library selects Catholic books exclusively. For one reason, there are not enough Catholic books now produced to meet all the needs of a Catholic library. Exact figures in the matter seem to be lacking. In the United States, it is certain that the number of Catholic books published is in a smaller ratio to the total book production than that of the Catholic population to the total population. Such crude estimates as we have indicate that, while the Catholics are about one sixth of the people of the United States, they publish not more than one fiftieth, perhaps as little as one sixtieth, of the total number of new books.

In 1937, a bibliography of Catholic books was prepared for a "Catholic book week"; it included "1,500 titles . . . from the turn of the century to the present day."[1] That number, no doubt, does not represent a true total; perhaps it should be at least doubled. Yet even doubled it would be less than a hundredth part of the titles published in the United States during those years. Possibly that is why some Catholics reach out to claim as their own any writer, such as, say, Willa Cather or Dorothea Brande, who shows sympathy with the Catholic way of life or Catholic principles.

A conjectural analysis of this conjectural estimate of Catholic book production might indicate that the largest number of Catholic titles are in apologetics, with books on theology, philosophy, sociology, history, and fiction following in that order. A more profitable analysis is to divide the Catholic books into those that are fully entitled to the name, such as works on the Scriptures, theology, and canon law, and so-called Catholic works of fiction, or history, or philosophy, or the like, that at best embody a Catholic point of view wherever their subject matter touches upon Catholic beliefs and principles.

---

[1] Mary Louise Gilman, "A Catholic Book Week in Boston," in *The Catholic World*, 145:93-95. (October, 1937.)

In one sense, it is as incorrect to speak of a Catholic philosophy or Catholic history as of a Catholic mathematics. In using such terms, what is meant is that Aristotelian-Thomist philosophy, for instance, or Platonic-Augustinian, has centuries of Catholic associations, has an indirect regard for revealed truth; that history can be looked at with that same regard as an aid to interpreting, although not to recording, human events. Thus also, a Catholic novel, even in its most rigorous definition, means a work of fiction that accepts and applies Catholic standards of conduct.

In estimating the quality of Catholic books, that distinction of strict and loose use of the phrase can offer some help. Catholic books in the strict sense of the word have a pretty good assurance of sound content because of the practice of official censorship. Every book by a Catholic directly dealing with matters that touch upon Catholic faith and morals must be scrutinized and approved before publication. But censorship offers no guarantee of skill in presenting the truth which the book may contain, because its concern is only with doctrine. In literary value, in readableness, in interest, in power to influence readers, as also in the worth of their political or economic or scientific theories or their understanding of history, Catholic books can be, and often are, dull, dreary, wrong-headed, and ineffective. As the connection of a book's content with Catholic beliefs becomes more remote, all assurances of its value dwindle. There are Catholic books on the market, and in Catholic libraries, that are eminently trashy.

Hence, Catholic book production by no means solves the problems of selection that confront the Catholic librarian. Where he does get special help from his being a Catholic is in the criterion of library needs. For the Catholic librarian that criterion is sharpened and made more definite, not merely by the standard of revealed truth, but by an ethos and temper of thought inspired by conclusions from revealed truth and strengthened by the long and steady traditions of Catholic teaching. *Securus judicat orbis* has a wider application than the strictly dogmatic.

That wider application is still a human effort, not infallible, not divinely safeguarded, needing all the knowledge and skill that can be brought to it. In so far as it includes the dogmatic and moral teaching of the Catholic Church, it is an absolute standard for judging the content of a book. Non-Catholics think of such a standard almost with horror, as a tyranny. It *is* a tyranny: the tyranny of the foot rule, of the multiplication tables: a tyranny most welcome to any man who knows how essential are definitions to the very concept of liberty. In so far as that Catholic ethos covers loosely the kindred fields of thought in which Catholic belief, although not directly concerned, can be normative, it is a helpful, but not an absolute, standard for judging the value of a book. It is then part of the Catholic culture, as distinct from the Catholic religion.

In practice, the Catholic point of view in book selection varies from one librarian to another, because of the librarians' varying knowledge of the Catholic religion, their varying degrees of general intelligence, acquaintance with books, library experience, their virtues and vices, even their varying temperaments. There are narrow and intolerant Catholic librarians, who merit the charge of bigotry. There are ignorant and lazy Catholic librarians. There are Catholic librarians in whom conceit has hamstrung what natural intelligence God gave them. Only one Catholic as an individual is infallible; and he is infallible, not as a librarian, but as the universal teacher of the Catholic Church. Problems of book selection are not solved for the librarian by the fact that he is a Catholic. He can get immense assistance in meeting the problems from his Catholic background; but he has to work hard at his own equipment if he is to make a reality of that possible assistance.

The Catholic librarian has a further help, not always fully appreciated, in holding himself to an intelligent choice of books, and in refusing to be stampeded either by volume of book production or by shrill advocacy of "the latest." This help comes to him through his good fortune in usually being poor. It is a blessed poverty that forces a librarian to choose of the best books because he cannot afford to buy less than the best. If the comparison be not too invidious, many a poorer Catholic library may be less encumbered with literary junk than its rich neighbors. There is, to be sure, a level below which poverty, in the library as in the home, becomes a real detriment and danger. Library slums are as unwholesome as city slums. But what one may call a decent poverty can be a source of vigor and wisdom in the choice of books.

In this connection we may recall the notorious fact that Catholic school libraries are generally smaller than non-Catholic libraries, and that their rate of growth has been slower. One explanation of that fact is quite simply the comparative poverty of Catholic libraries. Another explanation, not dissociated from the first, is that many Catholic libraries, once they had built up a sound core of established and dependable books for their library, were in no hurry to add new books of uncertain value. The craze for mere numbers did not beguile them. That caution, obviously, is often imposed by lack of funds; it may at times be overdone; it may starve the library; but it is ordinarily a healthy caution. In one Catholic library, the librarian usually waits from six to eighteen months before buying new books, unless the evidences of their excellence and their usefulness to his patrons are overwhelming. He has thus more chance to gather data for a judgment on the value of the books.

It is not without significance that by far the greater part of Catholic writings on library work deal with the problems of book selection. The central reason for that fact is Catholic concern about the religious and moral influence of books. Catholics share with the rest of the modern world in appreciating the importance of the printed word; but their enthusiasm is not unlimited; it halts more often than the general enthusiasm to ask, "What kind of printed word?" A minor reason for Catholic concern about book selection is Catholic poverty. Let it be bluntly said that non-Catholic libraries are in general, although with many exceptions, less affected by those two considerations. Both their greater uncertainty of standards and their larger resources give them a greater ease before the problems of selecting books. But it is an open question whether or not all Catholic libraries rejoice in the twofold Catholic restrictions; certainly poverty as a blessing in disguise does not appeal to all of them.

Catholic concern over the qualities of books that go into Catholic libraries is admirable in itself. But that is not to say that it is always well-informed. We are forced to admit that it is sometimes more distinguished for moral earnestness than for accurate knowledge and sound judgment. It has at times a tendency to see evil where none exists. It never will be well-informed in any Catholic librarian who is over-smug about his moral standards, and who thanks God that he is not as those other librarians.

4. Aids in Book Selection

A vast amount has been written and published about aids in book selection. There seems to be no end of treatises on the subject, books, articles in periodicals, addresses at library conventions, discussions in women's clubs, classes in library schools, to say nothing of the enormous production of book lists, book reviews, singly and in collected form, recommendations and condemnations, all the way from the throbbing blurb of the publisher's hired man to the pontificating of the pundits.

One reason for this profusion is the evident importance of wise book selection for all libraries. Amongst other reasons these two may be noted: the almost pitiful eagerness of many librarians to have some one tell them what books they should buy; and the readiness, at times a little bumptious, of self-appointed critics to instruct the librarians. From the combination there result both benefit and mischief. Wobbly librarians get some sort of guidance, which at least rescues them from the sad predicament of Buridan's ass that starved between two haystacks; but it sometimes happens that they are led to eat of very inferior hay.

The extremes in the business are both bad: to take the aids offered as substitutes for the librarian's own responsibilities in selecting books; and to ignore the aids altogether. It is highly improbable that any librarian is so fully equipped with knowledge of books that he can entirely dispense with help from others. It is in general dangerous to accept an outsider's judgment as the final decision on choice of books. It is more than dangerous, it is disastrous, to make some school association's Procrustean "list of books" the flat measure of any particular library. To steer the middle course here calls, as it always does, for understanding and judgment. Some of the books on aids in book selection can help toward understanding the problems; but no books can confer good judgment.

Aids in book selection may be considered as positive or negative in character, as directing choice toward, or away from, certain books. It will be convenient to divide what little can be said here on the subject under those two heads.

A. Positive Aids

All positive aids to the librarian in choosing books reduce to a simple formula: the opinion of experts. Although they are offered in various ways, and come from many sources, the final test of the value of those aids is the genuineness of the experts. Put that way, the test is fatal to a great many apparent aids in book selection. But to apply the test creates a new problem for many a librarian: how is he to estimate the worth of the experts?

One device for meeting the new problem is to add up a lot of opinions on a book, find the majority for or against, and follow that majority. In a completely honest world of book reviewers, that naive procedure might work at least as well as it does in political life, where counting votes takes the place of moral or economic analysis. In the actual world of often venal and prejudiced reviewers, the majority vote as a deciding influence becomes absurd. In any case, a collective vote upon books has only the significance that so many persons think thus and so; it does not touch the competence of the voters; it is an evasion of the problem, not a solution.

In general, recommendations of books for library choice take two forms: one is based upon at least a brief description and analysis of the book; the other is only an *ipse dixit* of judgment. "Lists of books" without annotations are of the second type, and may be more mischievous simply because they cover more territory. A judgment based upon some account of the book (the form most often taken by book reviews) will depend for its value upon: the clearness of the reviewer's account; and its honesty and freedom from bias. There is not a librarian in this country who buys many books a year but has at some time or other been fooled by a reviewer's account of a book. Even so, book reviews almost always have some value as aids in book selection. At their lowest, they offer a suggestion; at their best, they offer a real, if brief, introduction to the character of the book.

But it must be repeated that in every instance the usefulness of the book review to the librarian goes back to the competence and honesty of the reviewer. Sometimes, the test of experience enables the librarian to single out good reviewers, in whose opinions he can thereafter place some confidence. But he must beware of extending that confidence to the periodical for which his dependable reviewer writes. Periodicals change their reviewers.

As an illustration, some years ago a Catholic venture in book guidance was begun, in the form of a quarterly publication of compact reviews of books. Its earlier numbers were excellent. They gave a definite notion of what each book considered really was. They gave concise reasons for the reviewer's opinions. Then the quality of the reviews began to drop. Perhaps Catholic libraries failed to support the venture financially. Perhaps the competent reviewers were no longer able to give the time and labor demanded for keeping at their task. For some reason or other, the descriptions of books dwindled, or became muddled, or were not given at all; and the reasoned opinions became plain gush. Those who had once welcomed this publication, and had placed confidence in its reviews, would be ill-advised to continue their confidence.

Hence, even in using aids toward the choice of books there are no short-cuts. The librarian's vigilant intelligence is needed constantly to keep the aids from becoming hindrances. In a school library, the librarian is fortunate if he can command the occasional assistance of men who are really experts in their field. Their informal suggestions and advice are invaluable as an aid in book selection. Unfortunately, that aid is naturally limited to older books already known to the teachers from some other library. As regards newly published books, the teachers rarely have any more knowledge to go upon than the librarian has.

B. Negative Aids

Negative aids in general are warnings against bad or useless books. Their value again depends upon the competence of those who utter the warnings. Some of the negative aids are blanket proscriptions, in the way of broad principles laid down; some are specific condemnations. They are all lumped together as one form or other of censorship, official or private. There are government censorships, censorships of particular groups, church censorships.

The idea of censorship is very ancient. It is a corollary to the manifest fact that books may do harm by influencing beliefs and conduct contrary to truth and right. But it includes also the conviction that individuals often will not protect themselves, and through themselves society, against bad books, and that pressure of one sort or another must be brought to bear upon them in order to save them from their misuse of books. It is this last element which affronts the pride of men and makes the notion of censorship generally repellant. Men generally resent the implication that any one else can decide about their reading (or anything else they do, for that matter) more competently than they can themselves. They also dread the abuse of such power as censorship.

There is scarcely any government in the long roll of history which has not set up some form of censorship. The Greeks and Romans had it. The Catholic Church had it almost from its earliest years. When modern States began to shape themselves definitely, they prohibited certain books. The English State began censorship by law at least as early as 1382. Later, Protestant States vied with Catholic States in their repressive laws. Hilgers insists that Protestant States were, and are, much more drastic in their control of books than the Catholic Church has ever been.[1] Even the League of Nations set up a censorship, in 1923, in a code ratified by thirty-seven governments.[2]

---

[1] Joseph Hilgers, S.J., *Der Index der verbotenen Bucher*, Freiburg, 1904; pp. 92 sqq., 192 sqq., and *passim*. See also George Havens Putnam, *The Censorship of the Church of Rome*, 2 vols., New York, 1906-1907; vol. II, pp. 237-269, for a summary account of censorship in a few Protestant states.

[2] Supplement to the *American Journal of International Law*; vol. 20, pp. 179-189. (1926)

Universities used to be influential censoring bodies; but apparently they no longer condemn books, at least directly and openly. The days of authoritative pronouncements by the Sorbonne, Oxford, Padua, Tubingen, and Berlin seem to have passed; although Putnam quotes some instances of university censorship as late as the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.[1] Private groups exercise censorships in various small ways within their reach, particularly some of the organizations for temperance and moral uplift. Several English Catholic writers have complained of an effective kind of censorship, an almost complete boycott against them in the secular press. Many men who hate being censored love to censor others.

But the one censorship of which everyone seems to have heard, although few have bothered to find out what it really is, is that of the Catholic *Index of Forbidden Books*; it is one of the things that raise blood pressures. It dates back to 1559, in the *Index* of Pope Paul IV. Its procedure was clarified by the bull of Benedict XIV, *Sollicita ac Provida,* in 1753, and by another revision under Pope Leo XIII in 1897, through the constitution *Officiorum ac Munerum* and general decrees containing forty-nine rules.[2] The Leonine legislation has remained substantially unchanged since then.

There are three elements in that censorship. The first is a set of general principles derived from the natural law and from divine law, indicating the sorts of books which are mischievous. These are the true fundamentals of the Catholic legislation about books, and the first fulfilling of the Church's duty to warn her children against harmful books. The second element is a specific list of books forbidden, by no means including all that are forbidden by the natural law, but instancing a limited number to which circumstances call special attention. The third element is composed of reasonable exemptions from the prohibitions and of spiritual penalties for wilful violation of the laws about books. The exemptions, as liberal as are consistent with the safeguarding purpose of the *Index,* are in favor of those who by reason of their position and necessary work have need to read books otherwise forbidden. Some of the exemptions are general, such as the use of books that have become classics, even if obscene, by mature students, or the exemption of cardinals, bishops, and other prelates from the law; some are particular, granted to individuals by competent authority.[1]

---

[1] *Op. cit.*, II, 250-251.

[2] Putnam gives an English translation of both constitution and decrees, *ibid.*, II, 388-403.

To claim that there was never any abuse of the censoring power by members of the Catholic Church would be absurd. But the serious student of its history and functioning must be amazed that the abuse has been so slight, and is forced to conclude that Catholic censorship of books has, with a few instances of exception, been exercised with prudence and justice, both in its condemnatory decisions and in the application of its laws. That it works great hardships upon scholars and students is a non-Catholic myth and bogey. For the librarian, it is a valuable, if only a negative, aid in selecting books.

In practice, Catholic libraries are bound to exercise care in keeping books forbidden by ecclesiastical law from getting into the hands of those who are not authorized to read them. That means, at once, that forbidden books may not be placed upon "open shelves." Even when the forbidden books are in closed stacks, they must be kept from common use. In some Catholic libraries, forbidden books are segregated from the rest. In others they are shelved in their normal places, with some such notice as "non-circulating" to indicate that they are not available to all.

5. Some Minor Problems

Even with a general policy established for the selection of books, and some understanding of how to use aids in selection, there remain many difficulties of detail. Here we shall touch briefly upon only three of these minor problems: the selection of periodical material; the allocation of the book budget in school libraries; and the problem of useless books already in the library.

A. Periodical Material

The level of periodical publication in the United States is not high. Although it may displease newspaper and magazine producers here to say so, the fact is that American work of that sort, in general, is not as intelligent as the French, or even the English. In quantity, our periodical material makes up for what it lacks in quality. The United States Bureau of the Census reported for 1935 a total of 12,285 periodicals in the United States, by no means a high-water mark of production, because the depression had killed off several thousands of them. Of these more than half were weekly publications (6,303), nearly one fifth were dailies (2,233), and nearly one sixth were monthly publications (2,009). The total circulation was 265,815,821, more than two copies per capita. The Catholic periodicals, numbering a little more than 300, are about one fortieth of the total.[1]

---

[1] See the chapter, "Exemptions and Exceptions," in Joseph M. Pernicone, *The Ecclesiastical Prohibition of Books*, Cath. Univ., Washington, 1932; pp. 193-214.

From a cultural point of view the market seems to be overcrowded with periodicals; from a financial point of view the huge number must be successful in meeting a popular demand. Some persons look upon periodicals as the enemy of the book, even the enemy of the capacity for intelligent reading. To the librarians of public libraries, they are something of a headache: so numerous, bulking so large, taking up so much storage space, printed upon such perishable paper. Most of them have no place in school libraries, a fact for which school librarians may be grateful. The vicious and trashy periodicals can be ruled out. The problem for the school library, to select amongst the relatively small number that can be of use, must be solved, just as the book problem is to be solved, by the librarian's judgment based on the interrelated criteria of intrinsic worth, serviceableness to the library patrons, and the limitation of library funds. No book can do more than point to these bases for a solution.

Of Catholic periodicals a special word may be said. By their general character they appeal to the Catholic librarian; but they must be judged according to the same criteria as all other periodicals. In any lump estimate, they rank a little higher than the common level of American periodicals, but not so much higher

---

[1] *The Catholic Press Directory*, Chicago, offers the following figures:

1928	
Total	291
Weeklies	106
Monthlies	127
Quarterlies	26

1932	
Total	310
Weeklies	113
Monthlies	131
Quarterlies	31

as to bear favorably comparison with the periodicals of other countries. Speaking generally, they are neither strongly enough supported by the Catholic reading public to enable them consistently to pay for good work, nor staffed by men capable of making them instruments of large influence. A considerable number of them are little more than pious channels for alms to help seminaries and missions. There are a few good Catholic historical periodicals, a few good magazines of a general cultural and recreational sort, two or three weeklies with some definite character. For the librarian's point of view, the problem of choice here is not complicated by any embarrassing wealth of excellent publications; on the score of quality, he can usually limit his choice amongst forty or so out of the total number. What may complicate his problem are the tugging loyalties to support periodicals on grounds extrinsic to their quality.

B. Allocating the Book Budget

This problem may crop up in any library; but it exists chiefly in school libraries, at any level, which serve several distinct departments of teaching, and is more acute in the college and university libraries. The problem is simply that of balancing the needs of the various departments against the limited funds of the book budget. Some schools used to divide up the book fund amongst the heads of departments, and leave the selection of books to them; but that practice seems to have died out almost completely as unpractical. In other schools, a percentage of the book budget is earmarked for each department, so that the head of the department may make book demands upon the librarian up to the limit of his percentage. This system has been found to lead to as much jealousy between departments as the first, and to a wasteful procedure of buying books to the limit assigned, whether the books were really needed or not.

The third method, most sensible and practical where the librarian is competent, but sure to fail where the librarian is not competent (in which case also the whole library fails), is to leave the entire question of meeting the needs of the various divisions of the school in the hands of the librarian, who will study the requirements of each department, and with the aid of advice and suggestion sought from the teachers, strive to share his book fund equitably with all the genuine needs of the school; he has a better general view of the strength and weakness of the book stock in comparison with that relative use; he can co-ordinate his book buying, whereas the natural separatist tendencies of the different departments make it difficult, if not impossible, for them to work harmoniously for the balanced building up of the library. This method of allocating the book budget does not, of course, destroy departmental rivalries; but it does minimize their mischievous influence upon the library.

C. Discarding Useless Books

Every decision in book selection implies at least a temporary rejection of other books offered at the time. To discard useless books from the library is to apply this selection-with-reverse-english to books that have already gotten into the library. It sounds simple to say that useless books have no place in the library, that they waste shelf space and the labor involved in caring for them, and therefore they should be discarded. The catch is in deciding what books in the library are really useless and should be thrown out.

There are no mechanically accurate tests of a book's usefulness. Quantity of use is not the last word in deciding. Trashy books may move from the shelves much more often than excellent books, for the plain reason that there are more readers with a taste for ephemeral thrills than readers who relish scholarship or literary excellence. In a school library, books neglected by one batch of teachers for years may be appreciated and put to use by succeeding teachers. It is even a prudent rule for the librarian to be slower in rejecting a book of any intrinsic worth at all, once it has entered the library, than in rejecting it before buying.

Yet, with all this qualification and much more in the same vein that might be said, the fact remains that every library is likely to have on its shelves books (and still more pamphlets) that have outlived their usefulness to its patrons, and that should be gotten rid of. Sometimes these books can be turned over, through sale, exchange, or gift, to another library in which they may prove to be of service. Sometimes they can be sold to dealers.

More often, perhaps, they should be destroyed. Occasionally attempts have been made to set up a common storage for books that several libraries wish to discard.[1] There may be possibilities in that method; but it seems likely to become merely a deferring of decision indefinitely on what to do with the books. The real difficulty is in the combination of accurate judgment about the usefulness of the book and firmness in deciding to discard it. Given intelligent decision, any way that is convenient will do for disposing of the discarded books.

---

[1] C. E. Sherman, "Extending the Walls of the Central Library," in *Library Journal,* 54:579-585. (July, 1929.) For another angle on discarding books, see M. K. Reely, "Relieving Crowded Shelves: a Problem in Weeding," in *The Wilson Bulletin,* 4:255-258, 268. (February, 1930.)

CHAPTER V

PROBLEMS OF CLASSIFYING BOOKS

If there is one point upon which modern librarians are all agreed, it is this: that getting books into the library is only the rude beginnings of library work. It is about equivalent to that part of the old French recipe for cooking a rabbit which began, "First, catch your rabbit." The refinements of librarianship, like the refinements of cuisine, begin after the rabbit is caught.

The first of the steps in organizing the books for use, or, we may even say, in making a library out of what is otherwise only a gathering of books, is to reduce the books to order, to arrange them in related groups. That is the most generic notion of book classification. In an analogical use of Scholastic terms, one might say that books are the prime matter of a library, and that classification is its substantial form.

The modern emphasis upon the classification of books in a library should not lead us to think that it is a new technique in libraries, or that librarians of earlier ages were not concerned about it. To think that would be to lose historical perspective; and historical perspective is a valuable thing even in the most practical problems of today. Without attempting to go farther back than Plato, Richardson records 161 systems of classification, primarily, it is true, classifications of knowledge, but intended as a basis for classifying books.[1] Of systems of classification devised for actual use with books, Albert Maire reckoned up 150 or more.[2] Sayers summarizes the schedules of nineteen of these latter, from that of the monastic library of St. Riquier, A. D. 831, to the systems, as late as 1847, of Schleiermacher and

---

[1] E. C. Richardson, *Classification: Theoretical and Practical.* 2d ed., revised, New York, 1912; appendix, "Essay towards a Bibliographical History of Systems of Classification."

[2] Quoted by Albert Cim, *Le Livre: Historique, Fabrication, Achat, Classement, Usage, et Entretien.* 5 vols., Paris, 1905. Classification is dealt with in vol. IV.

Thienemann.[1] Dewey's Decimal Classification, the first of the systems in wide use in the United States, was not published until 1876.

When books are few in number, it is a simple matter to classify them. Almost any basis of classification may serve, and the librarian may be casual enough in borrowing some other man's scheme or devising one of his own, because it will be no great matter to drop the classification if it prove unsatisfactory, and take up another. It would look like empty pedantry to fuss too much about the organization of a few hundred books, or to apply to their classification some comprehensive ordering of human knowledge. That holds as true today as it did at any stage of the history of libraries.

But men had not to wait until the modern huge production of books to have libraries that were large enough to call for more than simple schemes of classification. Within a hundred years after the European invention of printing, book classification began to be elaborate. And if one notes in the many schemes from the time of Conrad Gesner (1516-1565) up to the nineteenth century a considerable family resemblance, it is because for all the diversity of these schemes they were devised within what was still the traditional European framework of knowledge. Within that framework librarians worked cautiously, realizing that for their already large collections of books a bad system of classification would be a disaster. It would hamper the future management of their books; and it could be changed only with much labor and expense.[2]

As the libraries continued to grow in size, the problems of classification demanded increased attention. The older schemes were not meeting the new situation. For American libraries, the major problem seemed to be solved by the Decimal Classification, which Dewey offered at the beginning of the last quarter of the nineteenth century. It is important to remember that Dewey's scheme was original only as a new combination of elements of classification. The decimal arrangement of divisions in the scheme has been traced back as far as the system of Lacroix du Maine in 1583, planned for a fixed shelf scheme;[1] the schedules were based upon the inverted Baconian arrangement set up by W. T. Harris in 1870 for the public school library of St. Louis.

---

[1] W. C. Berwick Sayers, *Manual of Classification*, London, 1926; folding tables accompanying chapter XI.

[2] It may be recalled that Rule 3 of the Jesuit rules for the librarian (version of 1580) set down the common classification of those days, by *facultates*, that is, in the hierarchy of knowledge. Rule 14 (revision of 1932) forbids the librarian to change the scheme of classification without permission from authority above that of the rector of the college, and consultation with experts.

One man who was not satisfied with Dewey's Decimal Classification was Charles Ammi Cutter (1837-1903), librarian of the Boston Athenaeum. In the same year in which the Decimal Classification appeared, Cutter had published his excellent *Rules for a Dictionary Catalogue*. Fifteen years later, he devised his Expansive Classification, with an alphabetical notation to fit a base that could be expanded to the 26th power of 26, applicable to small libraries in the first few expansions, and to almost any number of books in the seventh expansion, which he had not completed at the time of his death.[2]

In 1897, six years after Cutter had begun his publication of the Expansive Classification, the Library of Congress was moved into its present splendid building.[3] It then had about 2,000,000 volumes. The classification in use to that time was a modification of Bacon's scheme, devised by Thomas Jefferson, inherited by the Library of Congress when it bought Jefferson's library of 7,000 volumes in 1815, and modified again by John Meehan in 1861. The librarian, Dr. Herbert Putnam, reorganized the Library of Congress in its new building, and assigned to Charles Martel and James C. M. Hanson the task of planning a new system of classification, designed to meet an indefinably large increase in the book stock. The new scheme was founded upon the Expansive Classification which Cutter was then striving to complete in its seventh expansion, but with suggestions of the Decimal Classification in its subdivisions. An outline of the main classes and divisions was published in 1904; and the detailed schedules have been published part by part since then. Although not yet completed, these schedules when bound into volumes fill up nearly three feet of shelf space.[1]

---

[1] A. Cim, *op. cit.*, vol. IV, p. 309.

[2] C. A. Cutter, *Expansive Classification, Part I: The First Six Classifications*. Boston, 1891-1893. See also Sayers, *op. cit.*, ch. XV.

[3] Forty years later, in 1937, to meet the need for book space, an Annex to this building was completed at a cost of over $8,000,000. The main building will house 5,000,000 volumes, the Annex has a capacity of 10,000,000 volumes. See pamphlet on *Annex to Library of Congress*, U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington, 1938.

By the time the twentieth century had well begun, American librarians had three large classification schemes of their own. In the meantime, librarians in other countries were also developing schemes of library classification, one or other of which we may refer to later on. But in general these foreign schemes had little interest for American librarians. They were busy using the home-made arrangements, and talking and writing about them. The Survey of Libraries in the United States conducted by the American Library Association in 1927 disclosed that, of the 1,268 libraries reporting, 96% of the public libraries, and 89% of the college and university libraries, used the Dewey Decimal Classification; only 20 public libraries and 4 college libraries, less than 2% of the total, used the Cutter Expansive; and 3 public libraries and 14 college libraries, less than 1½%, used the Library of Congress Classification, some of them with considerable modifications.

As for the talking and writing about schemes of classification, whilst it evinced the interest of librarians in this important library technique, it had two bad results. The first was to destroy the sense of proportion in some of the librarians in charge of small libraries. They created classification problems where none existed, by transferring to their own situation a discussion of details which belonged only to very large libraries. The second bad result was contention over the rival merits of the D. C. and L. C. classifications. Partisanship became at times violent, with the usual production of more heat than light, with small fry classifiers throwing their weight about, and even the lady librarians losing their equanimity.

Into these contentions some Catholic librarians also injudiciously thrust themselves; not many, but enough of them to cause some confusion and bewilderment in a larger number. In 1932, it was estimated that about twelve Catholic libraries had changed their classification to that of the Library of Congress.[2] The fact in itself had simply no special significance. Had an equal number of Catholic libraries changed over to Brown's Adjustable Classification, we should in all probability never have heard of it. But the little handful of Catholic adherents of L. C. Classification joined with the non-Catholic to make up in noise what they lacked in numbers. All this controversy was, and is, a waste of energy, and a source of unfruitful distraction in library work. If we glance at it here, it will be only in passing, and in the course of illustrating some of the problems of classification as they are likely to affect Catholic libraries in the United States.

---

[1] For accounts of the plan and sequences, see "Account of the Catalogues, Classification and Distribution Work," in *Library of Congress Bulletin*, vii, 1904; and *Reports of the Librarian of Congress*, beginning with 1901. Summary accounts are offered in most books on classification, such as Richardson, Brown, Sayers, Mann.

[2] Jeanette J. Murphy, "The Library of Congress Schedules on Religion," in *The Catholic Library World*, 3:37 (February, 1932).

But before looking at those problems from the Catholic point of view, we must, for the sake of clearness, consider briefly the nature and purpose of library classification, and something of its theory.

1. The Nature and Purpose of Library Classification

The classification of books in a library may be summarily defined as an ordering of books by some measure that groups them together for the convenience of the readers. The immediate aim of the arrangement of books is to secure order; but that order is not an abstract or speculative goal; it is in turn a practical means to another end, namely to make it easier for the reader to locate the books he wants. That idea of classification would seem to be fairly obvious as an immediate consequence from the general character and purpose of all libraries. Libraries are not just collections of books; they are collections of books intended to be read. All the techniques are directed to linking the reader and the book. Yet it is amazing how thoroughly this central notion is lost sight of in the disputes over classification.

What standard of order the librarian takes as his basis of classification must, to be reasonable, depend upon the books he has to deal with, the readers whom he is to supply with books, and the particular relations between the readers and the books. If he keeps those three considerations in mind, he can ignore all external laws of classification. Any system of organizing books is a good one that suits the books to be classified and meets the purpose of classification in making straight the path of the reader to the book.

Thus, in a small library, organized for its owner's practically exclusive use, the librarian might make the owner's known preferences and habits of reading the foundation for his scheme of classification, and might group the books in a way that, although shocking to a "professional" classifier from a public library, facilitated their use by the owner of the library: and that would be good classification.

In a larger library, with a considerable number of readers, the convenience of the readers might demand that a first classification be by size of the books, folios, quartos, octavos, and so on; or by frequency of use, the most used books on shelves at eye-level or just below it, the less used books on the more remote shelves. If it fits in with the convenience of the readers, books may be classed by form, or by their relations in time. In fact, in even a library of modest size one may find today as many as a dozen or more bases of classification in use at the same time, all determined by the three elements of classification, the kind of books, the kind of readers, and the relations between readers and books. The writer once saw a library of several thousand volumes actually classified by the color of the bindings; but the lady who owned the library did not often disturb the books. Perhaps that was an excellent classification for a library which was intended for decoration rather than use.

With every notable increase of the three ingredients, the books, the readers, and the relations between them, the purpose of classification becomes more difficult to attain. A scheme of classification that works admirably in a library of twenty to a hundred thousand volumes may bog down badly in a library of over a million volumes; whereas by far the greater part of an elaborate scheme for classifying the million volumes library may have to be discarded when the scheme is applied to a little school library of a few thousand books.

An organization of the books in a branch public library, quite satisfactory to its casual readers, may be infuriating to the earnest student who tries to use the library. The reader who has free access to the shelves needs a kind of classification which may be of no particular use to the reader who must approach the books through a catalogue. As the interrelations between the elements that determine the functioning of a scheme of classification multiply, it is no longer a simple matter to know just what organization of the books will be convenient for even a majority of the wide variety of readers.

If there are any conclusions to be drawn from this sketchy consideration of the general character and aim of library classification, they would seem to be these: that we should not dogmatize too much about classification; that we should avoid apriorism as vicious; that we should recognize the supremacy of principles of classification over any particular application of them in a set scheme. It is well to remind ourselves that no scheme of classification perfectly exemplifies the demonstrable principles of classification; and that for reasons which we must now consider. Perhaps the best way to consider them will be to look at some theories of library classification, from two points of view, one general, the other specifically Catholic.

2. Some General Problems of the Theory of Classification

Accepting the broad definition that library classification means the ordering of books by groups for the convenience of the readers, and recognizing the fact that the books themselves differ in different libraries and that the readers also differ in their approach to the books, we have the choice of several ways of facing a widely varying library situation. We may fall back upon a kind of individualism, or home rule, or even anarchy, and say that the problem of classifying books must be solved independently by every librarian for his own actual and probable book collection and his own group of readers. Theoretically there is a good deal of sense in that proposal. Like many another theory, it is quite logical. The difficulty with it, as with so many theories, is that it will not work, because of the limitations of the people who would have to put it into execution. The plain fact is that not all librarians are capable of doing such an independent job of classification. A very large number of librarians, perhaps the overwhelming majority of librarians, must have some help offered them; without aids from outside their own intellectual resources, they must flounder impotently; they stand in real need to have some scheme devised for them.

If the general run of librarians must lean upon a scheme of classification set up for them by some one else, should that scheme be limited to an outline and a set of principles to guide the librarian in developing the outline to fit his particular library? Or should it go farther, and make the application of outline and principles complete to the last details, implement the scheme in the fixed form of classification schedules? The answer to such questions must depend upon the capabilities of the librarians to be helped. The more intelligent and better skilled librarians will welcome some latitude in working with an outline and a few guiding principles; perhaps they will insist upon enjoying some such latitude, even when they accept a detailed scheme. But how numerous are librarians of that kind? How many other librarians are there who are terrified by the problems of classification, and who will not feel secure without the most complete and rigid formula, one that they can follow as an exact rule? We are left to conjecture in answering that sort of question. The situation has to be faced, apparently, upon an estimate that again reduces to theory.

A. The Theory of Uniformity in Classification

For some time there have been strong tendencies toward desiderating a universal and uniform system of library classification, at least as a theoretical idea. In the United States, toward the close of the nineteenth century, the very wide acceptance of the Decimal Classification seemed to bring the ideal within practical reach. But when the Library of Congress Classification began to be published, and when its use was vociferously urged as a scheme nearer to the ideal of an all-embracing system capable of standardizing the classification of all libraries in the United States, ridiculous quarrels broke out between the supporters of D. C. and L. C. classifications, and made clear that the search for uniformity must begin all over again.

It is a curious fact that all this pother about uniformity in library classification should become so strident at a time when the Western world was rapidly losing the traditional coherence of knowledge that once had formed the framework within which many schemes of library classification functioned locally. When the break-up of the Great Tradition in education, the separatist tendencies of Protestantism and later skepticism, and the centrifugal forces of fact-studying sciences had all resulted in a violently disparate sense of values, in a destruction of the old hierarchy of knowledge, then the librarians began to be very much hot and bothered about standardizing and making uniform the classification of one of the great vehicles of knowledge. There is more than a paradox here.

A sort of explanation of the anomaly may be found in observing the tendencies toward centralization, in the industries, in governments, in school organization, which developed parallel with the separatist tendencies in human thought. One may say that as men were increasingly driven apart by skepticism and scientism, they sought for some external bond of unity which might replace the old bonds of unity in faith and culture, and endeavored to make regimentation take the place of understanding and charity.

This strange social change is profound in its cause and in its effects. We are concerned with it here only as it bears upon one technique of library service. In so far as it has terrorized the librarians of small libraries into thinking that, in order to have their libraries function at all completely, they must classify their books according to a standard pattern set up for them, it has been thoroughly mischievous, and has been an impediment to intelligent library development. One minor instance of this tendency to regimentation is the campaign to introduce the use of Library of Congress cards into other libraries. But pressure toward uniformity comes from many sources. For Catholic libraries, it has a particular significance, because by far the greater number of them are small libraries, staffed by rather timid persons.

But for any kind of library, uniformity of classification with all other libraries, even if it could be achieved, is of doubtful value. It might conceivably be convenient for the classifiers. But it is the convenience of readers, not of the classifiers, which is the aim of classification. As to the readers, the number of them who voyage from library to library is comparatively small. Of that small number how many are capable of even recognizing differences in classification between one library and another? They use the catalogues to find the books they want, or if they have access to the shelves, they are guided by a librarian. Only a small fraction of this small number of readers would bless uniformity of classification or curse differences of classifications. To make this tiny group a measure of classification, instead of the much larger group that regularly uses each library, is to violate a cardinal principle of good classification, is to put a boast of the classifiers in place of the convenience of the readers.

As a theoretical counterbalance to these tendencies toward centralization, standardization, and uniformity in library classification, it is here suggested that it would be a move toward increased library efficiency if we encouraged librarians to study principles of classification more than schedules, to familiarize themselves with the three elements that furnish guides to classification, the book collection, the readers, and the readers' approach to the books, and to aim at making themselves masters in classifying their individual libraries according to their concrete circumstances rather than mechanical followers of a scheme of classification that may be ill fitted to their particular situation. Possibly this is a counsel of perfection as ideal as the search for the perfect universal scheme of classification; but even so it is a humanly nobler counsel.

B. *Classification of Knowledge vs. Classification of Books*

Setting aside this point of disputable theory, modern librarians are generally agreed that books should be classed primarily by content or subject matter, allowing, however, for other bases, such as form or time, in subdivision of the classes. But in discussing subject matter as a foundation for classifying books, some librarians have recently stressed a distinction that does more to confuse than to clarify the problems of classification. They distinguish between a classification of knowledge and a classification of books. In one sense the distinction is valid: a hierarchy of knowledge transcends books, may be considered independently of books. Plato and Aristotle did not have books immediately in mind when they talked about the interrelations of truths. But a classification of books cannot ignore the hierarchy of knowledge, because books exist precisely as a means of storing and conveying knowledge; they have no meaning apart from the knowledge they contain.

It is obvious that the librarian is immediately concerned with classifying books. It is quite possible for him to classify books by qualities independent of any scheme of knowledge, such as the size of the books, their age, the initials of their titles or authors. But if the books are classed by content, they must be related to the order of knowledge which that content implies. That relation is inescapable, so much so that in point of fact there is no modern scheme of book classification that does not contain, openly or implicity, no matter how muddled, some theory of the organization of knowledge. Even if the main classes of the scheme disclaim any such theory, the sequences or progressions cannot avoid some notion of an order, even a relative value, of topics; and that means an implied theory of knowledge. This is not a purely abstract question. It has a very definite meaning, as we may see later, in the technical practice of a Catholic library.

C. The Theory of Expansibility

A final problem of theory in classifying books arises out of the fact that the scheme of classification must be built around the existing books in a library, yet must also allow for books that in the future may come into the library. Expansibility is as necessary a quality of a good classification as it is of a good library. With few exceptions, such as the project proposed to Henri III by Lacroix du Maine, which was for a library ultimately limited to 10,000 volumes, all the older schemes of classification envisaged a future expansion.

But the modern enormous production of books made librarians most acutely conscious of the need to organize their present book collection with much thought of its future growth. Now the problem comes from an inherent opposition between a classification of known, existing books, and a classification of books not yet existing, not prophetically foreknown, but at best only guessed at. The existing books necessarily stand in a fixed relation with other existing books. The scheme that groups them by classes has a certain inevitable rigidity because it deals with physical entities. In what relation will future books stand to the present books? No one can answer that question with more than a wild guess. There must be flexibility, not merely in the notation, but in the very structure of a book classification which is to include even the *futuribilia.*

The theoretical solution to this problem is some form of compromise. Rigidity and flexibility must each yield something to the other, each must become imperfectly rigid and imperfectly flexible. How much each is to yield, is a question instantly debatable, and debated, in every scheme of classification. As the scheme is planned more widely for use in a number of libraries, the debate on proportion becomes more important. Are we to put the emphasis upon the past, upon what man has already achieved by natural and supernatural means, and has, partially at least, recorded with some permanence in books? Or are we to stress in our classification the uncertain future of the discoverable, the hopes of achievements yet to come that may dwarf all that man now possesses of truth? It is a question of relative value.

Even in theory there will be divisions here amongst librarians. A whole temper of thought is involved in leaning markedly toward the past or toward the future. The humanist and the Christian are more impressed by what man has done for himself in accumulating wisdom, and what God has done to enlarge that wisdom through revelation, than by the possibilities of what the future may bring. The skeptic and materialistic revolutionary, with little faith in past values, have an enormous blind faith in future discoveries. Hence, not merely the spate of books pouring out from our presses, but also the current break with traditions, cultural and religious, have had much to say in the modern concern for the illimitable expansibility of library classification.

These problems of theory are knotty problems. A vast section of our 40,000 librarians in the United States are not only incapable of attempting to solve them, but have only the vaguest notion of what the problems are. Most librarians work along with one or other of the two prominent schemes of classification, D. C. or L. C., as best they can, criticising each occasionally in detail, swayed one way or another by emotional loyalties to a particular scheme or by the gusts of battle between partisan classifiers as these now and then reach their ears; and for the most part are serenely unconscious that back of the systems of classification they use are philosophic differences much more profound and influential than any differences in the surface theories of the two systems.

3. CATHOLIC ASPECTS OF THE THEORY OF CLASSIFICATION

Earlier in this little book, there was occasion to refer to the extremely important notion that there is a Catholic culture as distinct from the Catholic religion.[1] Part of that Catholic culture includes the Catholic attitude toward knowledge, and hence toward books as vehicles of knowledge. Catholics and non-Catholics alike have been vaguely aware of that attitude toward books; but the Catholic has often been as incapable as the non-Catholic of clearly defining what the Catholic attitude is.

We are concerned here with the Catholic attitude as it affects the classification of books, which it does from two different angles: as it regards Catholic books, and as it regards books in general. What are commonly recognized as Catholic books normally will form a considerable, but by no means always a major, part of a Catholic library. They include not only books about religion in its various phases, but also books upon topics closely linked with religious beliefs and practices. That means, besides the Holy Scriptures and the writings of the Fathers and books dealing with apologetics, exegesis, theology, dogmatic, moral, pastoral, ascetic and mystical, with canon law, liturgy, and hagiography, also books on philosophy in all its subdivisions, on the very nature of certitude, on the relations between natural and revealed truth, on such things as the principles and practices of education, the solution of social problems, the relations between the family and the state, and many other subjects not immediately part of the Catholic religion, but profoundly affected by Catholic principles.

These books have in the long course of centuries made up a definite Catholic literature, not equal in bulk, it is true, to the rest of the world's literature, yet very extensive, amounting perhaps to several hundred thousands of titles. Ever since they came into existence, these Catholic books have been highly prized by

---

[1] Cf. *supra*, the beginning of chapter II.

Catholics as one of the great means of preserving and spreading truth. There were centuries when Catholic books did much to shape the entire culture of the Western world. But with the modern break-up of Christendom, both Catholic culture and Catholic books have lost their leadership in the world at large.

The men who organized the great modern systems of classification were not well acquainted with Catholic books, and some of them were not a little hostile to what they did know of Catholic books. Between ignorance and hostility, they pretty well ignored Catholic books in setting up their schemes and schedules of classification. They could scarcely have done otherwise, granted the non-Catholic supremacy in the modern world of books.[1]

Catholic librarians have no quarrel with these devisers of classification schemes; but they cannot follow them in ignoring Catholic books. They are forced to consider any scheme of classification offered them, not only upon the grounds of its usefulness to serve the general purpose of classification, but specifically as it will serve that purpose for an important part of their own book collections. They recognize the fact that Catholic books fit awkwardly into even the religion classes of both of the widely used American schemes of classification, and are almost lost in some of the other classes. Both D. C. and L. C. classifications contemplate Catholic books at best in a cursory fashion, without much understanding of their relations to one another, and with the evident assumption that they are a minor and rather negligible part of the existing stock of ~~bonds~~. books.

That gives us one slant on the Catholic attitude toward the current theories of book classification. But there is another difference dividing Catholics and non-Catholics in their attitudes toward the theory of book classification. To consider it even briefly we must examine the Catholic attitude toward knowledge and books in general.

A recent writer has characterized the Catholic way of thought as distinguished by two marks, which he calls "totality of view and the sense of tradition."[1] Totality of view, he explains, means the inclusion of the spiritual as well as the material in the concept of reality. Maritain even speaks of "the primacy of the spiritual" as a Catholic mark. It has sometimes, perhaps not altogether happily, been called "other-worldliness" as opposed to exclusive concern with the material world. "The sense of tradition" is here used, not in the narrow meaning of one of the channels of revelation, but in the wider meaning of a lively and constant appreciation of the intellectual and moral continuity of the Catholic way of life.

---

[1] It is of interest to note that, in 1926, when the Library of Congress had about 3,500,000 volumes, its librarian estimated the total number of volumes on religion as only 125,000. *Classification, Class B, Part II, BL-BX. Religion.* Washington, 1927, p. 3. It is safe to conjecture that of that relatively small number of books on religion, not much more than one in thirty, the Catholic books would form only a minority.

These two elements are very close to the core of any truly Catholic culture. Together, they determine an approach to knowledge and books which the modern non-Catholic, with some exceptions, scornfully derides. It is the approach, easily labelled as "reactionary," "non-progressive," or even "obscurantist," which begins by reckoning our present store of knowledge, in the providence of God, as far more important than our possible future expansion of that knowledge here on this earth. It is an attitude of humility before the grandeur of the past. It is realistic about our human limitations, and preserves a sense of humor in the face of promised milleniums. It includes some scholarly understanding of how much treadmill work and rediscovery of the obvious there has been even in much of man's boasted discoveries. It recognizes the immeasurably high value of revealed truth in comparison with all human research. Father Bull goes so far as to say that the Catholic approach to learning, at least so far as the graduate school is concerned, is "the simple assumption that wisdom has been achieved by man, and that the humane use of the mind . . . is contemplation and not research."

Applied to the inevitable compromise in library classification between rigidity and flexibility, between the dominance of the known books and the unknown, the past accumulation and the future possibility, it urges the librarian to lean toward the side of the traditional, the established, the secure; and whilst allowing for future expansions of knowledge, and additions of books embodying those expansions, it steadily assumes that the future can never upset the past, that what may appear to be new details of truth must fit into the ancient structure of truth or damn themselves by their failure to do so.

---

[1] George Bull, S.J., "The Function of the Catholic Graduate School," in *Thought,* 13:363-380. (September, 1938.) For a slightly different approach to the same notion in education, see his *The Function of the Catholic College* (pamphlet), The America Press, New York, 1933.

Such an attitude toward knowledge and books is evidently a challenge to what many men call the modern mind. It must sound almost shocking to those for whom progress means only some further increase in man's dominance of the material world, for whom research, in the physical sciences, in medicine, psychology, and sociology, raises higher hopes of human happiness than they have ever found in God's revelation to man. It is an attitude hostile to the revolutionary hopes that man can lift himself intellectually, morally, socially, by his own boot-straps. It contradicts the prophets, from Bacon through Rousseau to Marx and Lenin, upon whose theories so much of modern education and modern librarianship is founded. It stands as a barrier, unnamed and sometimes unrecognized, between Catholic and non-Catholic librarians. It can be charitably ignored in the social relations between the two groups of librarians, just as it can be between Catholic and non-Catholic educationists. Individual Catholics may chafe at it and resent it and try to put it aside. It is not found sharply defined and courageously maintained in all Catholics. But it can never be entirely destroyed except by destroying all that distinguishes a Catholic culture from the culture of the surrounding world.

4. PRACTICAL PROBLEMS IN CATHOLIC LIBRARY CLASSIFICATION

Perhaps the best way to state the practical problems of classification which confront Catholic librarians is to express them in terms of the three elements upon which classification must be founded: the books, the readers, and the relations between the two. We must recall, then, that Catholic libraries are almost all school libraries, with their book collections, their readers, and their readers' approach to books all conditioned by the function of the library as part of a school apparatus. The books are related to the courses taught in the school. Teachers and students use the books in connection with their class work. Hence the outline of courses in the school catalogue can be of positive service to the librarian in classifying his books.

As regards the book collection, Catholic libraries are mostly small libraries. Of the 3,000 or so Catholic libraries in the United States, less than a dozen approximate 100,000 volumes or more, even in the sometimes inflated reckoning of their librarians, and only two or three approach the 300,000 figure. More than two-thirds of the total number have less than 3,000 volumes each. The remaining third mostly hover around the range of 5,000 to 40,000 volumes, with a dozen or so ranging between 50,000 and 100,000. That means that the overwhelming majority of Catholic libraries are untroubled by refinements of classification which affect chiefly the large public and university libraries. The battles of the classifiers rage far above their heads.

These two relative advantages, of small book collections and a homogeneous class of readers having a fairly common approach to their books, are offset by some disadvantages, some of which inhere in the Catholic librarians themselves, and some come from their relations with the library world around them.

To begin with, most Catholic librarians are part-time librarians, not always highly skilled in library work, sometimes with not enough time allotted to their library work. As one result of that fact, they are dependent upon external guidance in classifying even their small libraries. Then, they find the only help offered them to be schemes of classification that do not adequately serve the Catholic books which form so important a part of their book collections. No Catholic has so far come forward with a distinctively Catholic system of classification that is an effective substitute for either D. C. or L. C.

That is bad enough: that most Catholic librarians need help in classifying their books, and have only inadequate help offered to them. But one must in honesty add that it is open to question whether or not the general run of Catholic librarians would welcome a Catholic scheme of classification. Many of them are cowed by their inferior rating as librarians, which they despairingly accept as the hall-mark of all library work done by Catholics. Non-Catholic plans attract them, and win their confidence, more than Catholic plans. They dread putting what might appear to be an open and unmistakable barrier between their libraries and the non-Catholic libraries, just as many Catholic educationists dread an open breach with non-Catholic school organizations and teaching methods. They have a natural desire for fellowship with other librarians, and for the approval of eminent non-Catholic librarians; and they are sensitive to the vague pressure toward uniformity in library practice. Moreover, some of them seem to reserve their sharpest criticism for the work in classification done by a Catholic.[1]

The net situation, then, seems to be this. Catholic libraries limp along on the defective crutches of the classifications offered to them, perhaps nearly ninety-nine per cent of them using the Decimal Classification. They force their Catholic books into schemes that were not devised for them. They indulge in some sporadic talk about the unsatisfactoriness of D. C. and L. C. classifications; and, with a few exceptions, to be noted in a moment, they resignedly make the best of a bad situation.

Can this situation be improved? Can the practical problems of classification in Catholic libraries be solved? Any answer, yes or no, is only a probable answer. To weigh the probabilities, we must next review, however sketchily, some of the suggested ways of meeting the problems.

5. Some Catholic Solutions

The various attempts made or suggested by Catholic librarians to solve their special problems of classification may be considered under two heads: individual attempts, confined to a particular library; and efforts to produce a general solution to the problems, applicable in many or all Catholic libraries. We are here chiefly concerned with the latter; but may venture a word upon the individual library solutions.

No survey of these individual Catholic library classifications has been made. Indeed, none seems likely to be made. For one reason, most of them appear, so far as one can gather from observation and conversation, to be modifications of the Decimal Classification, and therefore, because of the law of copyright, cannot be published even in a survey. The modifications apparently are confined chiefly to the classes for philosophy and theology, 100, and 200. Sometimes they extend to an individual expansion of 348, canon law, or to some of the subdivisions in education and sociology. For the most part, these modifications seem to be guided by the sequences in the traditional Catholic teaching of philosophy, theology, canon law, church history, and so forth. To make such modifications calls for thought and care, especially in larger libraries; it is a task not to be undertaken lightly; yet it should not be beyond the capacity of an ordinarily skilled librarian. It would be most helpful to know how many Catholic libraries have ventured upon such adaptations of the Decimal Classification and how successfully they have worked them out in practice.

---

[1] An instance of this, which, unfortunately, does not stand alone, may be found in the attack made by the Rev. Colman J. Farrell, O.S.B., upon Merrill's *Code for Classifiers*. Merrill's work, although not done distinctively for Catholic libraries, was the only work of note done by an American Catholic in that field. Cf. *National Catholic Educational Association Bulletin*, 26:268-270 (1929). Merrill's reply is devastating. *Ibid.*, pp. 271-273. But one may doubt that the discussion had any appreciable effect upon Catholic library practice.

A few Catholic libraries have devised a scheme of their own, just as Harvard Library has done. One instance of a Catholic scheme of classification has been made public, so far as its main classes go. It was constructed for the library of St. Benedict's Abbey, Atchison, Kansas, and consisted of twenty-seven classes, with a Roman numeral notation.[1] Ten of the classes, V to XIV, follow pretty much the same sequences as are indicated in the divisions of the 200 class in the Decimal Classification. All the physical sciences apparently are grouped under class IV, natural philosophy, which may be an excellent arrangement for that particular library, but which might be very awkward for another library.

But for Catholic librarians throughout the United States, the chief interest will naturally lie in schemes of classification proposed, directly or indirectly, for general adoption by Catholic libraries. There are three of these schemes that have been publicized a great deal among Catholic librarians in this country: all modifications, one, of the Decimal Classification, the other two of the Library of Congress Classification. Catholic librarians do not seem to have paid much attention to the possibilities in Brown's Subject Classification, or in the most recent of all the large systems, devised by H. E. Bliss.[1] The three schemes with which we shall deal briefly are the Brussels modification of the Dewey D. C., the Vatican Library scheme, and the Alternative Classification for parts of the classes BR, BS, BT, and BV of the Library of Congress Classification.

---

[1] It is printed in the chapter, "Catholic Libraries and Librarians in the United States," by William Stetson Merrill, in *Catholic Builders of the Nation,* Boston, 1923; vol. IV, p. 342.

A. The Brussels Expansion, or Classification Decimale

At an international conference of bibliographers held at Brussels in 1895, an ambitious scheme was projected for cataloguing the bibliographical resources of the whole world. The Institut Internationale de Bibliographie was organized to carry out the project, and was subsidized by the Belgian Government up to the war. Its aim was nothing less than to produce "a catalogue capable of supplying information on the publications of all ages, all countries, and all subjects,"[2] estimated at 25,000,000 titles from the invention of printing to the year 1900, and increasing at the annual rate of 150,000 books and 72,000 periodicals.

For the sake of its notation, the Dewey Decimal Classification was chosen as the basis of classification, to be greatly expanded and supplemented by the use of auxiliary mnemonic signs.[3] The special interest for Catholic libraries came from the fact that the schedules for the class 200, religion, were worked out by a Catholic priest. For this reason, says Miss Fellows, who translated part of the schedules into English, this expansion of the Decimal Classification was adjudged by one of the leading librarians of the Vatican Library as better suited to his library than the L. C. Classification.[4]

The first publication of the scheme appeared in 1905. After some reverses from 1923 onward, the Institut succeeded in getting out a second edition of the *Classification Décimale Universelle,* in four volumes, 1927-1933. By 1929, it was claimed that 10,000 organizations in forty-two countries were using this system of classification. Professor Pollard had already translated into English the general outline and the section on optical sciences, with some explanation of the entire scheme of classification.[1] A few years later, Father Paul Foik, C.S.C., modified Miss Fellows' translation for the sections 230-249, dogmatic and practical theology. His modification is in use at St. Norbert's Seminary, West de Pere, Wisconsin, an institution for the training of some twenty Praemonstratensian students.[2]

---

[1] Henry Evelyn Bliss, *A System of Bibliographic Classification,* New York, 1935. The outline of his scheme had been published six years before, as an appendix to his *Organization of Knowledge and the System of the Sciences.*

[2] W. Berwick Sayers, *Manual of Classification,* p. 143.

[3] See *Ibid.,* chapter XIV, or his *Introduction to Library Classification,* 4th edition, London, 1935, pp. 59-60, for a brief account of the outlines and the auxiliary notation.

[4] *The Catholic Library World,* 4:23 (November, 1932).

B. The Vatican Library Classification

In 1928, Pope Pius XI set on foot the modernization of the Vatican Library, which as a public institution dated back to Pope Nicholas V (1447-1455), had been established in the Vatican Palace itself by Sixtus IV in 1475, and in 1928 had about 450,000 books and 60,000 manuscripts. The funds for the new housing of the books and manuscripts and for the work of reorganization came from the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. Because of that connection, a plan was worked out by which four American librarians were to go to the Vatican Library for three months in the spring of 1928, and four librarians from the Vatican were to study library procedure in the United States. An American firm built the stacks.

Of the four American librarians who formed the commission to the Vatican Library, two, James C. M. Hanson and Charles Martel, had devised the Library of Congress Classification, one, William W. Bishop, had been superintendent of the Library of Congress Reading Room when the L. C. Classification was planned, and the fourth, W. M. Randall, had worked as classifier under Mr. Bishop when he became librarian of the University of Michigan. In these circumstances, the Library of Congress Classification was adopted, "modificato leggermente per le esigenze della Biblioteca Vaticana."[1] These circumstances also give a distinctive meaning to Mr. Hanson's statement: "It is hoped that the Vatican Library may, through this reorganization, become a center of co-operation, such as our own National Library at Washington has come to be for American libraries."[2] Mr. Hanson indicated further that the Vatican Library was to be the center of assistance for Catholic libraries.

---

[1] A. F. C. Pollard, *The Decimal Classification of the Institut International de Bibliographie.* Cambridge Univ. Press, 1926.

[2] *The Catholic Library World,* 3:37 (February, 1932).

The Vatican Library has published its cataloguing code, which is based on the *A. L. A. Catalog Code*; but it has not published its modifications of the L. C. Classification. Hence, so far as classification goes, the Vatican Library offers no assistance to any other Catholic library. The only visible effect of its reorganization upon American Catholic libraries has been to give the proponents of L. C. Classification a new talking point, and therefore to make them a little more annoying to librarians who are not interested in the rivalries of D. C. and L. C. classifiers. It would be a mischievous error to assume that the Vatican Library ambitions any regimentation of other Catholic libraries, in the United States or elsewhere.

. C. *An Alternative Classification for Catholic Books*

In the early 1930's, a young American Catholic librarian, Miss Jeanette J. Murphy, undertook the construction of a classification scheme for books on four groups of Catholic subjects: Christian literature, theology, canon law, and church history. Her scheme did not aim at covering all Catholic books or including books on philosophy or other subjects linked with Catholic belief and practice.

The project was suggested to Miss Murphy by J. C. M. Hanson, one of the originators of the Library of Congress Classification, and was financed by a fellowship grant of the American Library Association.[3] Miss Murphy, as an enthusiastic adherent of L. C. Classification, worked out her alternative schedules to be used in place of classes BR, BS, BT, and BV of that classification; but left it open to librarians to adapt her classification to a decimal notation. For her notation she took the unused BQ of the Library of Congress scheme for ecclesiastical literature, adding to it T for theology, V for canon law, and X for church history.

---

[1] *Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana. Norme per il Catalogo degli Stampati.* Citta del Vaticano, 1931, p. 2. See also the brief account by Igino Giordani, "Modernizing the Vatican Library," in *The Commonweal*, 9:428-429 (13 February, 1929).

[2] *The Vatican Library. Two Papers.* By Msgr. Eugene Tisserant and Theodore Wesley Koch. Jersey City, 1929, p. 19.

[3] Jeanette Murphy Lynn, *An Alternative Classification for Catholic Books.* Milwaukee and Chicago, 1937, p. 22.

The classification is very closely worked out, listing nearly 10,000 entries for these four classes, and indirectly at least, suggesting still further expansion. Thus, for instance, BQT 953, for "The Journey to Emmaus," one of 102 entries for Christology, arbitrarily emphasizes that Apparition of the risen Christ, but by leaving four numbers open up to BQT 957, "Ascension into Heaven," allows the librarian to insert, if he should wish to do so, another subsection for books on the Apparition wherein Simon Peter was commanded to "feed my sheep." The outline and schedules are preceded by "An Essay toward a Philosophy of Classification," about fifty pages long, which does not throw much light on the subject, in part because the author seems to be struggling, at times unsuccessfully, with the difficulties of the English language.

D. Comment and Suggestion

The three proposed aids in classification for Catholic libraries here roughly indicated are really only two: an expansion of the Decimal Classification, and a limited expansion in an unused part of the Library of Congress Classification. The Vatican Library at most would offer a still more limited modification of the L. C. schedules. In fact, the Vatican Library Classification has been mentioned here, not because of any intrinsic importance attaching to it, but only because so much has been made of it in a rather misleading way.

Of the two large expansions, the Brussels Classification Décimale and the Alternative Classification for religion, it may suffice to say this: both are planned for very large book collections, or for intensive classification in special libraries; neither of them is devised primarily as a help to the common type of Catholic libraries in which the use of either of these huge expansions would be about as practical as employing a pile-driver to crack a peanut.

The value of each of these schemes of classification to the Catholic libraries would seem to lie in the suggestions they offer to librarians who are dissatisfied with their present system of classification and wish to revise it. There is guidance to be had from their sequences. But librarians have a still better source of guidance in classifying their books on religion, in the *Ratio Studiorum,* officially promulgated by the Sacred Congregation for Seminary and University Studies, upon which Mrs. Murphy Lynn has drawn.[1] It offers directly a most sensible ordering of the Catholic disciplines, which any Catholic library, large or small, can follow.

Although a scheme of classification is by no means the same as a scheme of notation, in practice the two are so closely linked together that, to adopt either the Classification Décimale or the Alternative Scheme for Catholic Books is to commit the library practically to the Dewey notation or the L. C. notation. In common sense, we must face the fact that the Dewey decimal notation is actually in use in most Catholic libraries in the United States. To change over from it would be an expensive procedure not justified by any advantage of one system over the other, particularly for libraries of less than a million volumes.

It is not within the compass of this book to try to solve the problems it discusses. But because of the confusion over classification engendered in the minds of many Catholic librarians by the quarrels over D. C. and L. C. classifications, the author here ventures to offer the following suggestions to the rank and file of librarians in the Catholic school libraries of the United States. In doing so, he keeps in mind the general situation of those librarians, often handicapped by lack of money, by lack of confidence in their technical skill, and by lack of time.

1. If you are getting along tolerably well with whatever scheme of classification is now in use in your library, pay no attention to the battles of the classifiers; just follow the army direction, "As you were!"

---

[1] For the Apostolic Constitution, *Deus Scientiarum Dominus,* on ecclesiastical studies, see *Acta Apostolicae Sedis,* 23:241-284 (1 July, 1931). Appendix I, pp. 281-282, offers a summary list of current courses in theology, canon law, and philosophy.

2. If you decide that you must revise your classification, try to make the changes within your present scheme. That is an obvious point of economy in time and labor.

3. In setting up new sequences within the outline of your present scheme of classification, follow the Roman *Ratio Studiorum* for the divisions and subdivisions under theology, canon law, and philosophy; follow your school catalogue in its list of courses for the other subjects. Only then, as a supplement, borrow from other schemes.

4. If ever a group of Catholic librarians effectively get together for some common solution of the problems of classification, may they be inspired to remember that they are trying to help *small libraries*. Perhaps, to get away from the bickerings about D. C. and L. C., they might further be inspired to take some simple outline of a scheme, such as James Duff Brown's main classes and basic notation of the Subject Classification,[1] supplement it with a compact body of principles to guide in its expansion, publish it in a small pamphlet, not copyrighted, and leave it to the librarians to apply each one to his own particular collection of books, for the convenience of his own group of readers.

---

[1] J. D. Brown, *Subject Classifications with Tables, Indexes, etc. for the Sub-Division of Subjects*. 6th edition, Grafton, London, 1914. Routledge, London, got out a useful summary in *The Small Library: a Guide to the Collection and Care of Books*, 1907. The Subject Classification is briefly explained in most of the modern books on classification.

CHAPTER VI

PROBLEMS OF CATALOGUING BOOKS

Of the 3,000 Catholic libraries in the United States, an indeterminably large number are not catalogued at all. Many others, perhaps a larger number, are inadequately catalogued. Lack of time and poverty of resources, no doubt, do much to explain these deficiencies in cataloguing. In so far as that explanation is valid, it is a waste of time to talk about it, since no amount of discussion can give the Catholic libraries more money and more labor to be spent upon library services.

But poverty is not the sole cause of the neglect of cataloguing in Catholic libraries. Conversation and observation lead one to believe that many of the Catholic librarians are rather terrified by the job of cataloguing their books. They are shaky about what they have managed to do in the way of cataloguing, and they view with apprehension what lies ahead of them still to be done. That diffidence is one of the problems of Catholic libraries. Hence it seems to be worth while to investigate a little the circumstances which have combined to make Catholic librarians afraid of cataloguing. In order to state the situation clearly, we must first consider briefly a few general facts about the cataloguing of books.

1. The Purpose of Cataloguing Books

The primary meaning of a catalogue is simply a list of things, a meaning which it had in Greek, Latin, and French, before it became an English word. But a catalogue promptly came to signify, not any haphazard list, but an ordered list. Even the *katálogos neôn* of the second book of the *Iliad* is more than a list of ships; it adds description, evaluation, classification, to the bare numbering of the Hellenic leaders. So a catalogue of books has come to mean a list organized for some definite purpose. It is the purpose that determines what kind of list the catalogue is to be.

There can be, and are, more purposes than one for a catalogue of books. Sometimes it has been no more than an inventory of the books, part of the "book keeping" of the librarian.

Sometimes it is a record of the way in which the books have been classified. More often it is a "finding list," of one sort or another, meant to let the reader know what books are in the library and where they are located. In modern usage, that purpose of helping the reader is taken for granted; and the discussion moves on to the question of how the reader is to be helped. In fact, the purpose of helping the reader is sometimes so much taken for granted that it is quite forgotten, and the technical details of cataloguing become rather an end in themselves: another case of not seeing the wood for the trees.

In the debates of cataloguers about how the reader is to be helped by the catalogue, and how much he is to be helped, there seems to be general agreement that a good catalogue should keep in mind both the reader's ease in scanning its entries, and its own expansibility to continue recording for the reader new additions to the library. The old ledger type of catalogue, with a number of items to a page, readily swept over by the eye of the reader, commended itself by its facility of use. But it was a most awkward thing to expand. The cataloguer left gaps in the list of books, to be filled in as new books were added; but it was impossible to foresee how many new books there would be, and hence there were not always enough gaps in the right place. Slips were pasted in; supplementary catalogues were made up: various devices to turn a naturally rigid catalogue into a flexible catalogue.

The card catalogue solves the problem of expansibility. Any number of cards may be inserted at any place in the group. But the card catalogue is not so quickly consulted as a ledger catalogue. The reader must finger one or more cards for each book represented; he may have to search around in a lot of card-trays. The gain in flexibility is at the expense of ease in using the catalogue.

Then the question arises as to how either the printed catalogue or the card catalogue can meet the needs of the reader who wants to get hold of all the books in the library by a certain author, and at the same time serve another reader who has no particular author or title in mind, but wants to see books on a certain subject. An author catalogue takes care of the first reader excellently, but is of no use to the second type of reader. A classed or classified catalogue meets the needs of the reader looking for books by the subjects they deal with, but is a stone wall to the reader who wants the varied works of one author.

It is evident at once that in cataloguing, as in classification, compromise is inevitable. There is no perfect catalogue, just as there is no perfect scheme of classification. The practical problem is how to arrange the compromises that must be made, how to secure the best assistance for the reader which the conflicting limitations render possible.

In the United States, the card catalogue has by now been almost unanimously accepted as the most practically serviceable type of library catalogue. But that settles only the question of style of catalogue, not the larger question of how, and how much, the reader is to be helped through the catalogue. Granted the card catalogue, what cards, and what organization of the cards, constitute a satisfactory aid to the reader in using a library?

The answer to that question should, in all common sense, take into account two essential elements of the problem: the character of the library, and the readers' approach to the books. A public library, an industrial or commercial reference library, a university library, a small college or high school library, will differ from each other, not merely in the number of volumes each may have, but in the kinds of books, and in the range of subjects covered by those books. Moreover, the readers in these different libraries approach the books in different ways. The heterogeneous readers in a public library need an amount and a kind of help through the library catalogue quite other than the help that teachers and graduate students in a university library will need; and undergraduate college and high school students need still another kind of help. The readers who have free access to the shelves do not need the same assistance from the catalogue as do those who must get each book at the charging desk. In general, what may be excellent cataloguing in one type of library, for one sort of readers, may be faulty by excess or deficiency in another sort of library, serving another sort of readers.

Here is a situation which readily creates bewilderment in the ordinary librarian. More, perhaps, than even in the problems of classification, he looks for external guidance in the problems of cataloguing. Some one, he feels, with greater adroitness than he himself possesses, must decide upon the compromise to be made in cataloguing; and he is most willing to follow a decision offered him.

The history of library cataloguing shows that there were many decisions, often widely conflicting, offered to the common or garden sort of librarians by the more eminent or more aggressive librarians. The controversies about cataloguing make quite as pugnacious reading as do the controversies about systems of classification. But gradually, in the United States at least,[1] a fairly common procedure was worked out, which was adopted in library after library, until now it is generally accepted as the basic structure of cataloguing, in the form known as the dictionary catalogue. The dictionary catalogue aims to serve every sort of reader, approaching the book collection from the direction of author, title, subject, or even form of literature. The American text-books which deal with the modern apparatus of library cataloguing all have in view the dictionary card catalogue.

2. The Modern Apparatus of Cataloguing

For American libraries, it may be said that the new age in cataloguing began with Charles Ammi Cutter's *Rules for a Printed Dictionary Catalogue.*[2] There had been several dictionary catalogues prepared before that time, amongst which the best known were the catalogues done by Charles Coffin Jewett for the two sections of the Boston Public Library, in 1858 and 1861, and the Manchester Free Library catalogue, in England, issued by Andrea Crestadoro in 1864; but they were isolated ventures.

---

[1] Dr. Richard Garnett, the Keeper of Printed Books, British Museum, in 1879 expressed an English view not uncommon amongst librarians: " . . . The cardinal error of plans for a dictionary catalogue appears to us to be an excessive deference to the claims of the average reader." And he stresses his point by recalling that the plans "originated in Manchester and were perfected in the United States . . . where the appetite for knowledge is as yet in advance of the standard of culture." *Essays in Librarianship and Bibliography.* London, 1899, p. 47.

[2] First published in 1876, as the whole of Part II (85 pages) of the *Special Report, Public Libraries in the U. S. A.* issued by the U. S. Bureau of Education. The work was several times revised, and was last published, in the fourth edition, by the U. S. Bureau of Education, in 1904, the year after Cutter's death.

What Cutter did was to synthesize the various schemes, and bring the most practical details suggested by each of them into a coherent and sharply defined body of procedure. His *Rules* aimed at outlining cataloguing practice for any library. All the later American work in building up cataloguing codes has been based upon Cutter's *Rules.*

In 1876, the year of the publication of Cutter's *Rules,* the American Library Association was founded, with Cutter a very active member. One of its first concerns was for the technique of cataloguing. Late in 1877 an A. L. A. Committee was appointed to draw up *Rules for an Author and Title Catalog,* which were printed in the Proceedings for 1883, and reprinted eight years later, as Appendix I to the third edition of Cutter's *Rules,* 1891.

That was only six or seven years before the Library of Congress began its most impressive development, in a new classification, new cataloguing, new housing, new policies of administration. The A. L. A., already a growing power amongst librarians, appreciated the advantage of linking itself closely with what had by then become, not a mere reference library for the legislative branch of the United States Government, but a rich and influential National Library; perhaps also it began even then to envisage the possibilities of a Federal Control over libraries as well as over schools. In 1900, it entered into an agreement whereby the Library of Congress "was to supply printed cards for current books, beginning, if possible, with January 1, 1901."[1] Its committee on revision of Catalog Rules was to make "special efforts . . . to secure agreement between the rules of the Library of Congress and the new A. L. A. Rules."[2] In 1902, the Library of Congress printed the *A. L. A. Rules—Advance Edition,* and distributed copies of it free to all libraries that requested them.

---

[1] By 1937, the Library of Congress was supplying catalogue cards to about 6,000 of the nearly 16,000 libraries of the United States. *Report of Librarian of Congress, 1937,* p. 249. Including the time and labor involved in ordering these cards, the delay in getting them, and the rehandling of books because cards are not printed for all the books, especially in a Catholic library, the cost of these cards is higher than the cost of making cards in one's own library. *Experto crede!*

[2] *Catalog Rules. Author and Title Entries.* Compiled by the Committees of the American Library Association and the (British) Library Association. American Edition. Chicago, 1908. Preface, p. v.

The English Library Association asked, in 1904, to join in the programme, and its committee worked with the A. L. A. Committee on the final form of the Rules, published in 1908.

In the meantime, the question of subject headings, to be used with the author and title entries in a dictionary catalogue, was not overlooked. A committee of the A. L. A., with Mr. Cutter as one of its three members, began in 1892 to compile a list of subject headings. The first list was published in 1895; a revised and enlarged list in 1898; and thirteen years later, in 1911, the last edition was produced. In spite of the desire for uniformity, there were differences in the A. L. A. subject headings and those of the Library of Congress. As part of its plan of publicizing its classification scheme, the Library of Congress first printed its *Subject Headings* in 1909-1914; a second edition in 1919; a third in 1928.

The importance of all this accumulating apparatus of cataloguing need not be emphasized here. Two significant aspects of the development, however, must be pointed out. The first is that, even as late in the progress of the work as 1901, the A. L. A. Committee concluded that "its decisions must be guided chiefly by the requirements of larger libraries of a scholarly character; that only incidentally would it be possible to outline modifications or variations of practice suitable for the smaller libraries."[1] The second is that the A. L. A. Committee constantly had in mind, not only consistency in the form of catalogue entries, but, quite a different thing, uniformity in the practice of cataloguing in all libraries.[2]

It is true that, later on, several books were published by the A. L. A. for guidance in the cataloguing of small libraries.[3] Moreover, the *A. L. A. List of Subject Headings* was allowed to lapse out of print, because it did not agree thoroughly with the Library of Congress *Subject Headings;* and its place was taken by a list which both conformed closely to Library of Congress practice and was intended as a help to small libraries.[1] But the major interest of the cataloguers continued to center upon the more complicated problems of the large libraries.

---

[1] *A. L. A. Catalog Rules.* 1908. Preface, p. viii.

[2] "It was felt that the establishment of practical agreement between these codes would in itself present a notable advance towards uniformity in cataloguing practice." *Ibid.*, Preface, p. vi. This idea recurs throughout the Preface.

[3] Theresa Hitchler, *Cataloguing for Small Libraries.* (84 pp.) A. L. A., 1909; 2d edition, (316 pp.) A. L. A., 1915; 3d edition, (316 pp.) Stechert, 1926. Susan Grey Akers, *Simple Library Cataloguing.* A. L. A., 1927; 2d edition, 1933.

Yet it is worth noting that the majority of the libraries in the United States have always been small libraries. For instance, when the current development of cataloguing began, of the total of 3,647 libraries that reported to the U. S. Bureau of Education only 266, about one in each seventeen, had more than 10,000 volumes each.[2] Fifty-three years later, with all the great growth of libraries behind them, less than one in ten of the libraries reporting had as many as 25,000 volumes each.[3] Moreover, although the very bulk of the large libraries undoubtedly tends to complicate their cataloguing problems, those libraries have the advantage of being cared for by librarians with better skill and ampler experience than the librarians in small libraries. So far as need of guidance in cataloguing is concerned, it would seem that the more urgent need is in the small libraries.

In point of fact, the large libraries, because of the better equipment of their librarians, often have wider latitude than the small libraries in following A. L. A. and Library of Congress cataloguing rules. Some of them have even worked out their own independent methods, most notably the John Crerar Library in Chicago, and Harvard Library. The latter, since 1911, has carried out an interesting plan of "selective cataloguing," based upon a careful study of the library approaches of its different classes of readers.[4]

The small libraries follow the practice designed for the larger libraries as best they can, some of them with very intelligent discrimination, some confusedly, bewildered by an ideal of uniformity which they have been taught to prize highly, and in which the library schools tend to strengthen the recruits they send out to the libraries. But the discussion about cataloguing for the most part passes them by. The American preoccupation with size in libraries, another phase of the "bigger and better" concept, still manifests itself in an airy disregard of the small libraries that make up more than nine-tenths of all American libraries. Thus, for instance, an eminent librarian, meditating on the shortcomings of the dictionary catalogue, has said: "Every hundred thousand volumes added to the library but increases the task of consultation."[1] How perfectly true! Yet how nearly grotesque in view of the high probability that not one half of one percent of American libraries will add a hundred thousand volumes each to their book collections within the lifetime of their present librarians!

---

[1] Minnie Earl Sears, *List of Subject Headings for Small Libraries.* H. W. Wilson Co., New York, 1923; 2d edition, 1926.

[2] *Special Report. Public Libraries in the U. S., 1876,* pp. 772-773.

[3] *Statistics of Public, Society, and School Libraries in the U. S. 1929.* U. S. Bureau of Educ., Bull. 37, 1930, p. 5.

[4] For a brief account of this scheme, see T. F. Currier, "Selective Cataloguing at the Harvard Library," in *Library Journal,* 49:673-677 (1924).

3. The Situation of Catholic Libraries

When, in 1876, Cutter first published his *Rules for a Printed Dictionary Catalogue*, there were less than twenty Catholic libraries in the United States that had as many as 10,000 volumes each; of those there were three that had more than 25,000 volumes, and one that had 50,000 volumes.[2] How many Catholic libraries there were in all, it is difficult to estimate. One can only conjecture from what little is known of the Catholic schools of that year: 18 theological seminaries, with an average of 75 students each; 68 colleges for boys, which often had more high school students than college students; and 511 academies and select schools, chiefly for girls, and often including some elementary classes.[3] If we grant that there were between 650 and 675 Catholic libraries, it is fair to conjecture that at least 600 of these were libraries of less than 5,000 volumes each. The general conclusion, even from such vague indications, must be that the Catholic libraries were small libraries when the modern development of cataloguing began in the United States.

Not only were they small libraries; they were also nearly all school libraries; and they were libraries intended much more for the use of the teachers in the Catholic schools than for the use of the students. Almost without exception, they were "open shelf" libraries, in which the teachers, their chief patrons, had free access to the books. That kind of library, for that kind of readers, can be used quite efficiently without a catalogue. Many of the Catholic libraries did have catalogues, of one sort or another, but more as record lists and inventories of books than as tools to aid the readers in finding books.

---

[1] William Warner Bishop, *Practical Handbook of Modern Library Cataloguing.* Baltimore, 1927, p. 141.

[2] Figures compiled from the U. S. Bureau of Educ.'s *Special Report*, 1876.

[3] *Sadlier's Catholic Directory,* New York, 1875, p. 22.

The larger Catholic libraries, with few exceptions, had a priest as librarian, a man with some claims to scholarship in the fields chiefly covered by his library. He knew the books in the library quite well. He was concerned with their classification and their orderly arrangement on the shelves; a work that he had done practically unaided. He could put his hand upon any book he wanted without having to consult a catalogue. Most of the teachers who used the library (we may even add, in proportion as they did use the library) shared in the librarian's familiarity with the book collection. They did not demand assistance from a library catalogue.

Moreover, librarians and teachers, because they were scholarly men, had more than a little scorn for what many of them considered the petty fussiness of cataloguing. It was, in their view, an intricate and clumsy device to guide an indiscriminate and rather ignorant public in its approach to books in a public library. They had something of the same pride in their knowledge of books that many librarians have in their knowledge of techniques. Besides, they had no illusions about a democracy of intellect. Some of them developed a crusty impatience with library techniques, which they found, whenever they had occasion to use the catalogues of other libraries, an annoying barrier between them and the books they wanted, rather than an indispensable introduction to the books.

The smaller Catholic libraries were mostly under the care of religious women, whose routine of life and teaching rarely took them outside of their schools into the bustling world of the large libraries. Their libraries had a much more "homey" air about them than the libraries managed by priests or religious men. Rarely was there any separation between reading room and book stack; in fact, the entire collection of books was usually shelved around the walls of the reading room, with free access to the books for students as well as for teachers. Many of these smaller libraries were conducted almost with the informality of a private library. In that sort of library, it was rather an irrelevant and accidental matter that there should be, or should not be, a library catalogue.

Add to these elements of the Catholic library situation another, and an important one: the Catholic schools and teachers had not yet begun to imitate the curriculum and methods newly developing in non-Catholic schools; they still held to what is even now called the Great Tradition in education; they had, therefore, a vague distrust of the new library techniques as part of the revolutionary movement in non-Catholic education. There were, of course, varying degrees of this attitude of mistrust in different colleges. As illustration of an extreme instance of it, may be mentioned what occurred in one institution. Between 1899 and 1902, the library of this school, containing about 25,000 volumes, had been classified in the Decimal Classification, and completely catalogued, in a dictionary card catalogue of authors, titles, and subjects. Then another librarian, with a European background of excellent scholarship, was given charge of the library. He promptly scrapped the card catalogue, and supplanted it with a ledger catalogue vaguely modelled on that of the British Museum. His action provoked little comment amongst the teachers, who alone used the library, and who in any case were not much interested in a library catalogue.

When, toward the close of the nineteenth century, Catholic schools began to expand the facilities of their libraries for the use, not of the teachers only, but of the students, the old attitude toward library techniques was gradually modified. The necessity of a catalogue was recognized. Catholic librarians began to take interest in the abundant discussions about cataloguing then being carried on. But they soon realized that those discussions were chiefly concerned with public libraries and some of the large university libraries. The problems they dealt with did not seem germane to the Catholic libraries, still relatively quite small, and almost exclusively school libraries. The cataloguing codes appeared to many Catholic librarians needlessly elaborate, worried about a uniformity which had no appeal to them; the whole apparatus of cataloguing impressed them as a procedure designed, not for school libraries, with their homogeneous group of readers, and their simpler problems of reader approach, but for public libraries.

Not until 1909 did Miss Hitchler's *Cataloguing for Small Libraries* appear; and even that welcome consideration seemed to have in mind small public libraries, not small school libraries. For it must be remembered that the Catholic libraries continued to be small. As late as 1929, only six of the Catholic libraries reporting to the U. S. Office of Education claimed as many as 100,000 volumes each, and only one of those six approached the 300,000 mark. Perhaps we fail to appreciate the full implications of that fact.

In the United States, it is a common experience that anything small is made to feel apologetic. Certainly librarians in small libraries can abundantly testify to that experience. It is not necessarily imposed upon them from without. They themselves often contribute to it; they are conscious of their limited resources, their narrow field of action; they manifest a certain awe of the large libraries and their librarians. They unwittingly and sorrowfully subscribe to that part of the American credo which effectively says, "Only the great is good." In the Catholic small libraries that feeling of diffidence is often intensified, because the Catholic librarian knows that, in addition to being a little fellow, he represents a culture alien to the culture that surrounds him, and that he is, however politely, looked down upon as relatively "non-progressive," a new form of the old taunt against the *gens lucifuga.*

4. The Special Problem of Subject Headings

In libraries as small as are nine-tenths of the Catholic libraries in the United States, it is not at all a difficult task to prepare a satisfactory author and title catalogue. The stumbling block for the Catholic cataloguers is the management of subject headings and subject entries in the dictionary catalogue. It must be admitted that subject entries offer cataloguing problems in any library. Most cataloguers are rightly a little apprehensive about them. Their value is great, as opening up the book collection to readers who approach it with the question, "What books are there here on such and such a subject?" In any sort of library, such readers are likely to be numerous, although they are much less numerous in school libraries than in public libraries. The cataloguer must decide upon both the extent and the manner of supplying catalogue cards that will reasonably answer that kind of question from the readers.

It is clear enough that to make good decisions about subject entries the cataloguer must know well the contents of the library, and should have some idea of the ways in which readers are likely to think of the subjects that interest them. In a large library with a widely varying reader approach, the cataloguer cannot possibly have exact knowledge on those points. He must fall back upon conjecture, or else set up an apparatus of subject headings so comprehensive that it will catch any and every sort of reader approach. If the method is to be some study of actual reader approach, the cataloguer must work closely with the circulation department in a large library, have the circulation attendants submit suggested subject headings and criticize doubtful headings. But the method of using published lists of subject headings is the one more commonly in use. In one sense, that is the lazy man's way, and, as usually happens with the lazy man's way, it is the more laborious in the long run.

In the United States, there are three lists of subject headings widely publicized: the old A. L. A. List, the Library of Congress *Subject Headings* in its extended form, and Miss Sears' adaptation. The first difficulty of Catholic cataloguers comes from their timid deference toward these lists, which have the awe-inspiring authority of the A. L. A. and the Library of Congress behind them. All of these lists are meant only as aids, suggestions, in the choice of subject headings. All of them suppose that the cataloguers will make up their own lists of subject headings, with the published lists as a basis. The better skilled librarians in the large libraries know how to use the lists in that way; but one is often amazed at how slavishly, in the small libraries, these aids are followed as the beginning and end of subject headings. Catholic librarians all too frequently interpret the urge toward uniformity in library practices as including a close adherence to one or other of the published lists. Like so many others of the lesser fry of librarians, they feel impelled to bow three times in their presence, and cry, "Selah!"

Now for the Catholic librarians these lists of subject headings are not even as competent guides as they are for public libraries. They sin both by defect and by excess. They are deficient in suggesting subject headings for Catholic books, in much the same way, and for the same reasons, as the D. C. and L. C. classification schemes are deficient. Religious books, to say nothing of Catholic books, were not a major concern of the men who compiled the A. L. A. and the Library of Congress lists of subject headings. On the other hand, because these lists were designed as catch-alls for use in public libraries with a heterogeneous reader approach, they offer a wealth of headings, valuable for that sort of library, but bewildering to the librarian who is to catalogue a small collection of books for a closely knit and homogeneous group of readers.

There is no question here of finding fault objectively with the published lists of subject headings. The difficulty about using them in Catholic libraries comes as much from the timidity and helplessness of Catholic librarians as from the poor relationship between the great lists and the Catholic libraries. What concerns us here is simply the fact that many Catholic librarians feel urged to depend upon such lists, and at the same time find them so unsatisfactory.

Very little has been done to help the Catholic librarian in choosing subject headings. The most voluminous Catholic writer on libraries, Stephen Brown, S.J., ignores the problem completely; even his bibliographies are grouped by literary forms alone. William T. O'Rourke's *Library Handbook for Catholic Students* is not intended as an aid to librarians. The one brief reference it has to subject headings is discouraging, in that, by way of illustration, it offers in the subject entry for Chesterton's *The Everlasting Man* the heading "Man," which is an extremely odd subject heading for a book plainly dealing with Catholic apologetics.[1] Joseph Schneider's *Library Science,* the only manual of library methods by a Catholic, has three or four sentences on subject headings, one of which contains this statement: "The best guide in this matter is the third and latest edition of the A. L. A. subject heading book."[1] Miss Julia Pettee compiled a list of subject headings for books on religion, from the catalogue of The Union Theological Seminary, New York.[2] Although the work by no means ignores Catholic topics, it is intended chiefly for Protestant books, and naturally and properly is done from the Protestant point of view. Thus, for instance, the heading, "Ethics, Catholic. Jesuit." summarizes an entire historical viewpoint that is only amusing to the Catholic librarian. "Kingdom of Christ (Reign of 1000 years) see Millenium" is rather shocking in its narrow interpretation as the sole entry for books dealing with the Kingdom of Christ.

---

[1] In passing, it may be noted that "Apologetics" is a rejected subject heading in Miss Sears' *List of Subject Headings for Small Libraries,* a work compiled from usages in small public libraries. The Library of Congress *Subject Headings* includes "Apologetics," with a *see also* for Miss Sears' preferred entry, "Christianity—Evidences." Yet "Apologetics" is the specific subject dealt with in many thousands of Catholic books, from Justin Martyr to the present day, and is a heading sanctioned by nearly eighteen centuries of Catholic use.

5. Some Suggestions

Again the author feels that he should apologize for venturing any suggestions toward solving the problems of cataloguing books in Catholic libraries, just as he felt apologetic for the suggestions hazarded at the end of the chapter on classification. His excuse must be that he knows how little confidence in their own skill most Catholic librarians have, and how eagerly they look for some sort of guidance, particularly in classification and cataloguing. As a further plea for condonation, he will be brief.

To begin with, it is well to keep in mind the counsel with which Miss Hitchler opens her discussion of the general principles of cataloguing: "Do not make a fetish of cataloguing."[3] That can mean: don't make cataloguing an end in itself; its justification is only in so far as it serves the reader. It can also mean: don't be afraid of cataloguing; it is not a bogey; there are no mysteries about it, beyond the mysteries of careful work and a reasonable consistency. Perhaps, without too much distortion, it can even mean: don't worship uniformity in cataloguing; be content with a sensible consistency.

---

[1] *Op. cit.*, Catholic Education Press, Washington, 1924, p. 20.

[2] *Theological Subject Headings*, published in mimeographed sheets, 1924.

[3] Theresa Hitchler, *Cataloguing for Small Libraries*, revised edition (A. L. A., 1915; Stechert, 1916), p. 8.

For at least 2,800 of the 3,000 Catholic libraries in the United States, Miss Hitchler's book, or even the smaller work of Susan Grey Akers, *Simple Library Cataloguing,* furnishes all the directions needed in making cards for the main or author entries. Miss Akers' sound rule for title entries: title cards for all works of fiction, but for other books only when the title is distinctive,[1] is most sensible. Don't clutter up your catalogue with title cards like "Life of . . . ." Use subject cards instead.

Subject entries must be considered always from the readers' point of view: that determines how many subject entries there should be, and under what headings they should be made. Bishop suggests that "every author card, generally speaking, should have a subject card matching it."[2] In public libraries, that is probably excellent practice; but it is a dangerous rule to offer for school libraries. Instead, it is here suggested that the quantity as well as the form of subject entries in a school library catalogue be measured by the students' approach. In the vast majority of Catholic libraries, the cataloguer has an immense advantage here, in that she handles circulation as well as cataloguing, and therefore has the opportunity of observing the subjects under which teachers and students look for books.

That norm of reader approach is also the first guide in choosing subject headings. Abstract decisions about subject headings are always a second best; they may be inevitable in a large library, but should be avoided as much as possible in small libraries. The purpose of the subject heading is not to display the cataloguer's logic, but to lead the reader to a book. For instance, in every Catholic college, students will look for books on *Cosmology.* In Sears' list, that heading is rejected for *Universe*! To follow Sears here in a Catholic library is to defeat the purpose of having subject entries.

Another guide to the form of subject headings should be the customary usage amongst the teachers in the school, since this usage stands back of the students' terminology. It is worth while to consult teachers in doubtful instances. The subject headings in use in the school text-books and in the outline of courses of study should also serve for immediate guidance. Librarians who use these sources of subject headings may be astonished to discover how very nearly adequate they are for the practical purposes of the catalogue.

---

[1] *Simple Library Cataloguing,* 1927, p. 40.

[2] W. W. Bishop, *Practical Handbook of Modern Library Cataloguing,* Baltimore, 1927, p. 125.

Of the larger printed sources of guidance in choosing subject headings, there are three that Catholic librarians may find particularly helpful: *The Catholic Encyclopedia*; *The New Catholic Dictionary,* New York, 1929; and Donald Attwater's *The Catholic Encyclopaedic Dictionary,* Macmillan, 1931. All the manuals of cataloguing refer to the helfulness of encyclopedias in suggesting headings, for the good reason that the makers of encyclopedias have been at the task for generations. The two Catholic dictionaries mentioned are of the condensed encyclopedia type. They pretty well supersede the old Addis and Arnold *Catholic Dictionary,* although a ninth edition of that was published in 1917, and may still be useful for some specifically English subjects. *The Catholic Periodical Index* may also be of some help, although its policy in subject headings appears at times to be shaky whenever it ventures far from the leading strings of the *Readers' Guide to Periodical Literature.*

Finally, Catholic libraries, because they are small libraries, should note the special value to them of subject analytics, which bring to the readers' notice details hidden away in sections, or even chapters, of books, and thus enlarge the usefulness of small book collections.

CHAPTER VII

PROBLEMS OF DIRECT READER SERVICE

Everything done in a library is done, or should be done, for the benefit of the reader. That is a cardinal principle: that the library exists for the reader, actual or hypothetical; that it has no function except in terms of the reader. To put the same statement from another angle, the library does not exist for the glorification of the librarian, or as a stage on which to display the skill or erudition of the librarian, not even, in spite of the modern hubbub about the "apostleship of the book," as a pulpit from which the librarian is to preach his brand of literary uplift.

For that reason, the phrase "library service" is a good, descriptive phrase, and it deserves to be honored by librarians more than "library science," or "library techniques," and the like, since the latter are means to the end of library service. But library services fall into two natural divisions: those that affect the reader directly, and those that serve him indirectly. When the librarian selects books for the library, accessions books, classifies books, catalogues books, and so on, he is serving the reader. But it is a kind of service that often escapes the reader's notice, to say nothing of the reader's appreciation. The library services that the reader is aware of, that he cannot help observing, are those done when the librarian gets a book for him, or hunts up information for him, or compiles a reading list on some special subject for him. One may say that the charging desk is the dividing line between direct and indirect library services; the direct are out in front, the indirect are back in the work-rooms.

The earlier librarians would probably have been puzzled by the very name, "reference librarian." But in modern American libraries the reference librarian has become a very important person. Just what is the order of dignity in the hierarchy of librarians, it is not easy to determine; the protocols are not clearly defined. But ever since the ladies took over the major business of librarianship, one may at least harbor a suspicion that the preeminence in the ranks below the chief librarian has passed from the classifier and cataloguer to the reference librarian. The reference librarian is out where the holy light of publicity can illumine her job; she can be lady bountiful to the ignorant seekers after information in the library; she wears her omniscience like a crown. Even the attendants in charge of circulation can queen it a little over the readers. By comparison, the classifiers and cataloguers are hidden drudges, lost in the vast obscurity behind the charging desk.

For at least six out of seven of the Catholic libraries in the United States, these distinctions of rank amongst librarians are purely academic questions, since in these libraries the one and only librarian is head of all the departments, and is entitled to sing the Gilbertian ballad:

> "Oh, I am a cook and a captain bold
> And the mate of the *Nancy* brig,
> And a bo'sun tight and a midshipmite
> And the crew of the captain's gig."

But the distinction between direct and indirect services to the reader is valid in the smallest library. We have seen something of the problems involved in some of the indirect library services. We must now consider briefly the direct services: and first we must note the significant way in which these direct library services have grown within the past thirty years or so.

1. The Growth of Direct Reader Service

As a rough dating, we may set down the beginning of the twentieth century as that turning point in the history of American library history at which the direct reader services took on a new importance and a new emphasis. The last quarter of the nineteenth century was the period of the "Great Awakening" for American libraries. It was the period of development in schemes of classification, in cataloguing codes, in the organization of librarians, in the expansion of large public libraries, in the beginnings of formal education for librarianship. All this was an achievement of male librarians. It was the age of libraries dominated by Jewett, Cutter, Dewey, Poole, and Winsor. But at the close of that period, two events of great moment occurred. One was the increasing feminization of the schools and libraries of the United States. The other was the realization by librarians that the libraries had moved faster than their patrons.

The tone of library work began to change. The time had come to concentrate upon getting more readers for the growing stock of books, to bring the librarians out in front of the charging desk as "apostles of the book," as educators of all the people, from the tiny tots to the aged. And the ladies, God bless 'em, were there to see that things would move briskly in this new direction. To note this change is no part of any silly contention about the relative intelligence of men and women; it is simply an acceptance of the obvious fact that men's minds and women's minds approach library work in different ways.

From then on one may observe that librarians begin to be more social-minded, more conscious of their place in the community. Perhaps also one may observe that they are at times becoming more shrill. They have the nervous energy of reformers. They are not scholars lost away amongst their books; they are beginning to be extremely vocal publicists. Part of their publicity is energetic advertising of the public libraries. Part of it is a voluble scorn for the older type of librarian. There is a good deal of sneering at the "jailers of books," the old fogies who cried, "Boys! Boys! This is no place for you." There are trills of feminine laughter at those ridiculous male librarians who might have known the Greek and Latin and English classics and some mathematics and history and mediæval metaphysics, but who had never seen a library poster, nor dreamed of putting little blue vases and flowers in the library reading room.

Library techniques now began to include ways of stimulating reader interest: reading rooms were made more attractive; there were displays of new books, salesmanship through book jackets and posters, library tours, book reviews and discussions, storytelling hours for children, parent guidance, adult study groups. The public libraries began to welcome local organizations, naturally feminine for the most part, to meet in the library. They began to be hungry for questions to answer, and to advertise in various ways their reference services. The spaces out in front of the charging desk began to hum with busy bees.

The library periodicals took up the new line of direct reader services with fine enthusiasm. The A. L. A. conventions, or conferences, began to have as many sections as a political convention:

round tables for adult education, for art reference, for microphotography, for hospital libraries, for radio broadcasting, for the blind, for parent education, for publicity; sections for business and technology, for co-operation with Latin America, even for religious books. Public libraries began to boast of the increase in their "non-fiction" circulation. Some of the university librarians began to display a cheerful good will to take the burden of bibliographic work off the teachers' hands. The college and high school libraries, aided in this by the spread of "research" and the spell of the Ph.D. degree, joined in the magnification of the librarian's job. All the librarians began to get more public recognition, and to clamor for still more recognition, more money, and more authority, as the shapers of the national culture.

Up to the depression of 1929, the number of librarians in the United States had grown during the twentieth century nearly three times as rapidly as the growth in number of libraries and books.[1] That increase in the number of librarians was due to several causes; but one of the causes was the growth in direct reader services.

It was natural that this growth should be more pronounced in the large libraries, public and university. But it had its repercussions in the smaller libraries. More than one instance occurred in libraries with a staff of from three to six librarians, in which the direct reader services were enlarged at the cost of neglected cataloguing and wretchedly slipshod work in the indirect library services. Only the little solitary part-time librarians were out of the running, and apologetically hid their diminished heads. But by the 1930's the A. L. A. could feel a good deal of confidence in its statement of objectives which included, with the assemblage and preservation of books, "stimulation and guidance to promote their use."

These direct reader services may be considered, so far as our purpose here is concerned, under three heads: loan services, reference and bibliographic services, and what may be grouped as promotional services. The simplest loan service, the issue of books for home use, has been a function of the public libraries almost from the beginning. College and school libraries were slower in offering this use of books to their students. It is doubtful if, say in 1875, as many as one-twentieth of the college libraries in the United States permitted the issue of books for home reading; and it may astound some to know that not until 1906 was this service adopted by the library of the University of Michigan.[1] Now, of course, it is universal, and has spread into rich varieties of departmental libraries, reserve collections, and inter-library borrowings for university and college readers.

---

[1] *Statistics of Public, Society, and School Libraries, 1929.* U. S. Office of Education, Bulletin 37 (1930), pp. 2, 8.

Reference services in university and college libraries developed still more slowly. A certain amount of reference and bibliographic assistance, to both teachers and students, began to be given in a casual way at the loan desk as soon as the loan service was well established; but it was service asked for, not proffered. It was the blossoming of the graduate schools that brought about distinct departments of reference and bibliography in some of the larger university and college libraries. That the A. L. A. linked together in one section College and Reference Libraries was an indication of the hope that the work of the two sorts of libraries would take on something of a common character; its *College and Reference Library Yearbook,* from its first issue in 1929, rather ignores Reference Libraries[2] and concentrates on University and College Libraries. Its concern has naturally been with the large university and college libraries, since the smaller libraries either did not serve graduate school students or lacked facilities for any extensive reference service.

As to the services which include advertising the library, coaxing in readers, arousing the interest of readers, pushing the circulation of books, they too are more in evidence in public libraries than in university and college libraries. Readers in school libraries come by a sort of compulsion from the teaching methods in vogue. They are either teachers, who by supposition do not need stimulation or guidance in the use of books (in many cases, as experience shows, a most fallacious supposition), or students, who have the teachers to stimulate and guide them. But the librarians are shaking their heads over the fact that neither teachers nor students are notably enthusiastic readers.[1] The librarians cannot refrain from a little coaxing. A few of the more wealthy libraries have indulged in "browsing rooms" luxuriously fitted after the fashion of club rooms, aimed at encouraging reading in the students' leisure time, but not infrequently, as observers report, used as a nice place for a nap. The "dormitory library" set up at the University of Chicago in 1931 is a modification of this scheme, for which excellent results are claimed. Some of the smaller libraries, especially in girls' schools, try to imitate this incitement to reading by nicely furnishing an alcove, corner, or end of the common reading room and calling it a "browsing room." These latter schools also go in for book posters and other forms of advertising within the library. In general, although these direct reader services are less stressed in college and school libraries than in public libraries, there are indications that plenty of college librarians would welcome an enlargement of their functions as promoters and guides of the students' reading.[2] It is not a risky prophecy to say that in the near future they will be offering a great deal more of promotional services than they offer at present.[3]

---

[1] *Survey of Land-grant Colleges and Universities.* U. S. Office of Education, Bulletin No. 9, 1930; vol. I, p. 612.

[2] See the apology for ignoring them, *op. cit.,* 1929, p. 23.

Back of all this growth, and promise of growth, in direct library services is a conviction strongly held and loudly preached by many Americans, that adequate public schools and adequate public libraries can practically bring about the millenium. "The potential contribution which the library may make to the general welfare of a democracy and to 'the good life' of its citizens is unlimited."[1] Two other statements in the same book, although widely separated, may be brought together, since they point the contention of the entire book: "Unlike the public schools, public library service is not mandatory and not universal.[2] . . . American libraries may justly lay claim to all the arguments made on behalf of Federal aid to education in general."[3] Mr. Joeckel's is by no means a lone voice.

---

[1] See the comment on faculty reading, in Brown and Bousfield, *Circulation Work in College and University Libraries*, A. L. A., 1933, pp. 14-15. Robert Cooley Angell, *The Campus*, New York, 1928, p. 2, complained that the undergraduates do very little reading except under coercion of class assignments, and that their reading under compulsion tends to destroy any spontaneous interest in books.

[2] " . . . The increased demand might be regarded as an opportunity rather than a burden, were the library given adequate financial support." Brown and Bousfield, *op. cit.*, p. 27.

[3] The papers read in the College and Reference Section at the A. L. A. conferences illustrate the steady drive toward that goal. As a sample, see the outline of papers for the New Orleans meeting, 1932, *Bulletin of the A. L. A.*, 26:541-553. *The Chicago Tribune,* 7 November, 1938, in a column by June Provines, headed "Front Views and Profiles," quoted the following from the rules of a library at the University of Chicago: "Aside from books . . . the college library will endeavor to supply you with those practical necessities that will help make your student life a pleasure. Included in this personal service are pencils, pens, ink, blotter, as well as needle and thread for that missing button or accidental run."

2. Direct Reader Services in Catholic Libraries

Throughout this chapter no attempt is made to give statistical estimates of direct reader services. What few quantitative data have been gathered are so little connected as to be of slight value in forming a general estimate. That lack of statistics is still more evident in the Catholic libraries than in libraries in general, because Catholic libraries rarely bother to collect or preserve statistics about their work. Such sketchy discussion of direct reader services in Catholic libraries as is possible without exact data may be conveniently divided under the three heads already indicated.

A. Loan Services

In the Catholic parish and society libraries, which were more abundant in the latter part of the nineteenth century than they are now, the loan of books for home reading was a common practice from the start. Indeed, it may be said to be the only service offered by these libraries. Most of the libraries had only very small reading rooms; hence their books loans had to be for home use.

As regards college and school libraries, their loan practices were extremely varied. Some were borrowed from European customs, some from the usages of other schools in the vicinity. To reduce our account of them to some order, we may distinguish loan practices as they existed in boys' schools and in girls' schools, in boarding schools and in day schools. The most general observation that can be made is that books were lent more freely in boys' schools than in girls' schools, and in day schools than in boarding schools. The reasons for such differences are worth noting.

---

[1] C. B. Joeckel, *Library Service*, U. S. Gov't. Printing Office, 1938, p. 74.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 8.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 74.

The Catholic colleges and high schools for boys were most often conducted by priests or lay religious men, who lived a communal life on the school grounds, or in the school building itself. In almost all of these schools, the library was organized in two sections, one for the faculty, the other for the students. The faculty library was always the larger of the two. It was relatively strong in religious and philosophical works, the literary classics, and such scholarly books as suited the cultural and professional needs of the teachers. It had little recreational material. Very rarely was there a librarian in constant attendance. The door of the library was, for that reason, usually kept locked; but the key could be had by any member of the faculty. Ordinarily there was no restriction in the number of books, nor any time limit, for faculty loans from this library. Often there was not even a record kept of the books borrowed. Some librarians tried to get faculty members to enter their loans briefly in a ledger, at least by the accession numbers of the books; but generally with poor success.

Because the members of the faculty were secure in the use of their own library, the smaller collection of books for the students was administered with a fair amount of liberality. This students' library often had only a few hundred books; in only a few schools would it have as many as 3,000 volumes. It consisted of reference books, some books for collateral reading in the school subjects, books of edification, chiefly pious biographies; but its major content most often was fiction. In boarding schools, the library was often housed in a good-sized reading room; in day schools, it more frequently was only a distribution center for home reading. In both types of school, the library was open only before and after class hours, for the excellent reason that class periods were uniform for all the students. In boarding schools, where the open dormitory system largely prevailed until well on into the twentieth century, reading as well as studying was done in the common study-hall. Students could borrow books from their library to be read during the "free study" periods, but not during the periods assigned for study of class assignments, which were in the text-books only; and on rainy days were allowed to use the reading room and the study-hall for reading.

In the girls' colleges and academies, chiefly conducted by members of the Catholic sisterhoods, the students' access to the library was generally more restricted than in the boys' schools. As a rule, there was only one library for the faculty and the students. In some of the boarding schools, the students used the library only under the immediate supervision of the teacher who brought each group in turn to the reading room. In other boarding schools, students had access to the library whenever they were free of class or other duties, but could use the books only in the reading room. Some teachers also had small class-room libraries, from which they lent books to students at their own discretion. In the girls' day schools, there was wide diversity of loan practice; but one gets the impression that in general the provision of library loans was much more meagre than in the boys' day schools.

When the Catholic boarding colleges and schools began to have dormitories with individual rooms, and the students studied and read in their rooms, the loan policy of the libraries immediately became more liberal. In the day school, the general, even if slow, growth of the students' libraries brought about the same result. It is impossible to assign any common date for the change; but it is likely that its pronounced effects did not become apparent until around 1920. At present, although there is considerable variation in practice between different schools, all Catholic colleges, and most of the Catholic high schools, offer loan services to their students on about the same basis as the non-Catholic schools.

B. Reference Services

During the generation or two in which Catholic parish and society libraries chiefly flourished, hardly any of them attempted any reference work for their readers. Even in recent years the reference service offered by such libraries as that of the Central Verein in St. Louis or the American Catholic Historical Society in Philadelphia is not very extensive. Reference work was still more completely lacking in the earlier Catholic school libraries. The teachers looked for no such assistance. The students used the library almost exclusively for recreational reading. Only when the larger Catholic colleges, most of them after 1920, began to develop graduate departments, did the question of reference service assume any importance. In the decade 1920-1930, there may have been a dozen, but certainly not a score, of Catholic college libraries that had reference librarians. After 1930, the idea of reference work for students began to spread even into some of the smaller Catholic libraries. It was a vague idea, that usually did not lead to organized work. It was propagated by the few Catholic school librarians, mostly women, who were becoming increasingly interested in the programme of the A. L. A. It may be found active, in varying degrees, in perhaps a hundred of the 3,000 Catholic libraries. But even in these, very rarely is there a librarian expressly assigned to reference work.

C. Promotional Services

One may risk the generalization that Catholic librarians are much less aggressive in advertising the library facilities and in stimulating the use of the library by teachers and students than are the non-Catholic librarians. There is still a great deal of difference between Catholic librarians and other librarians in their whole approach to library work. For the sake of clearness, we shall defer consideration of that difference and the reasons for it until the next section of this chapter. For the moment let us look only at the facts of promotional services in Catholic libraries.

As a matter of fact, the tradition in Catholic schools, high and low, left the stimulation of the students to larger use of books exclusively in the hands of the teacher. The librarian was supposed only to satisfy demand for books; not to arouse or foster demand. It was generally believed that, since there were in Catholic schools at least twenty teachers to one librarian, and since the teachers were all day long in direct instructional contact with the students, it was the teachers' opportunity and responsibility to stimulate and guide the student in his reading. The teacher chiefly concerned with promoting an interest in reading was the English teacher. Teachers of history might also be expected to do something, at least, to encourage supplementary reading. Teachers of languages, science, mathematics, philosophy, seemed scarcely to consider the possibility of their students' reading much beyond the text-books. That was the general factual situation up to about twenty years ago.

When, again chiefly after 1920 or so, the Catholic colleges became more thoroughly engaged in imitating the organization and teaching methods newly developed in the non-Catholic colleges (often picking up a scheme just about when its originators were abandoning it as unsatisfactory), assignments of supplementary reading began to be part of the routine procedure in almost every department. But even then it was still the teachers who were pushing the use of books by the students. The librarians were still following, not leading, in the promotional work. Reading lists were made out by the teachers. A machinery of compulsion was set up in book reports, term papers, and the like. The use of the library increased, at first by leaps and bounds. In the College of Arts and Sciences, Loyola University, Chicago, between 1930 and 1938, the per capita book circulation grew nearly fourfold. Apparently, however, the students with few exceptions limited their reading to that portion of the book borrowed which was indicated in the class assignment. Although it is impossible, in this library, to make an accurate estimate of the ratio between compulsory and voluntary use of books, there are indications that as enforced reading has increased spontaneous reading has declined. There seems to be a sort of "Gresham's law" of reading too.

In the Catholic secondary schools, promotional work to get teachers and students to use the library more has become perceptible only in quite recent years, and is not yet widespread. What comparatively little there is of it is being done by the librarians, through posters, inspirational talks, extension of the "open shelf" access to books and the like; and is much more pronounced in girls' schools than in boys' schools. The propagandist phrase, "library-minded," has penetrated to some extent into all Catholic schools; but poverty, and the lack of leisure amongst the hard-worked part-time librarians who conduct most of the Catholic libraries, have combined to prevent anything more than sporadic efforts to make the propaganda effective. In addition, there is still the obstacle of that large difference in approach to library work between Catholic and non-Catholic librarians, of which mention has been made above, and the nature of which we must now try to indicate at least in brief outline.

3. The Major Problem in Catholic Libraries

It is only within the past ten or twelve years that as many as one-fourth of the Catholic librarians in the United States have become sharply conscious of the enthusiasm for direct reader services which had been mounting up in American libraries for twenty-five or thirty years. They were slow in realizing how thoroughly the world of libraries round about them had become filled with a sort of crusading spirit. Most of the Catholic librarians had little direct contact with the public libraries; they did not even read the library periodicals. But a few of them had begun to attend library schools in the non-Catholic universities, and there had caught the new temper of librarianship, and been indoctrinated in the "apostleship of the book." It was this little handful who began to spread the new dispensation in library work, slowly, amongst the rest of the librarians.

The attitude of Catholic librarians toward this profound change in library work has been confused and uncertain. Very few of them were well enough instructed to know the sources of the new enthusiasm for "stimulation to promote the use of books." It came to them, like so much else from a culture alien to their own, in the nebulous form of a social phenomenon of which they were rather abruptly made aware. Many of the Catholic librarians, again more women than men, were attracted by what seemed at first sight a movement calculated to spread literary culture more widely amongst the masses of the American people. Some of them, in their sincere zeal, saw in the movement an opportunity for the further propagation of Catholic instruction. They themselves, as a rule, were readers and students, within the limits of their ability and education; as librarians, they had the craftsman's regard for their tools, books; they were working in school libraries, and therefore were accustomed to the habitual association of books with the educational process. All of these facts worked together to strengthen their attraction to a programme of general increase in the use of books.

On the other hand, there has always been a realistic tradition in Catholic thought. It is often called a conservative tradition; and that is a good phrase for those who use language correctly. It does tend to conserve established values; it does counsel holding to the substance of solid achievement, and preferring the substance to some elusive shadow of earthly promise. Its idealism is kept for God's promises, in which it trusts absolutely; it is not ardently idealistic about man's promises.

That tradition of realism amongst Catholics comes from two sources: the doctrinal teaching of the Catholic Church on the Fall of Man, and the historical certainty that men have shown themselves only limitedly perfectible here on this earth. It would be out of place here to discuss at length the Catholic doctrine of the Fall. It must be sufficient to say that it has nothing in common with the Calvinistic teaching of the total depravity of human nature; but that it does recognize the existence in mankind of varying degrees of laziness, stupidity, selfishness, unruliness, which persists even after man's redemption and restoration to sanctifying grace, and which are constant obstacles to nobility and high intelligence in men's conduct. Even with the aid of divine grace, the struggle against these imperfections is unending. Linked with that doctrinal understanding of imperfect men is the calm historical judgment that men have only rarely, as, for instance, in the case of the saints, attained to striking success in the management of their imperfect natures.

In the concrete, as applied to the use of books, the realistic Catholic view appreciates that the educational use of books, like any other educational effort, calls for some measure of self-discipline, of doing violence to one's inborn laziness; and that the impulse to make educational effort *must come from within.* All who engage in any practical way in the work of education are aware of the enormous weight of educational reluctance in mankind, and of the meaning of the proverb that, though one man may lead a horse to water, a hundred cannot make him drink. As one instance of that truth, so many subscribers to religious magazines fail to read them when received that the magazines are almost useless as advertising media. The Catholic view distrusts external pressure as a means to internal resolve: a distrust that extends to every form of regimentation not imposed by divine law and under moral sanction.

Moreover, and this is more significant, the Catholic attitude regards books as only one of the many tools of education, and is by no means convinced that books are, for men in general, the most important of the educational tools. Many men have little aptitude for learning from books. A vast amount of the reading actually done has little or no educational value; it is a mere drifting, a means of killing time. Even when the reading is seriously done, Catholics have always been concerned about the character of the information it conveyed. They have never accepted the full implications of Bacon's theory that "knowledge is power." Least of all have they any tendency to worship purely factual knowledge, the sort of knowledge which is chiefly sought and praised in the modern world. Moreover, they do not forget that a man can get falsehood and degradation out of books. All this, it must be insisted, is not obscurantism, or hostility to books, or opposition to progress; it is simply intellectual balance, the good sense to understand that the value of books and reading is not unlimited.

Finally, Catholic realism accepts the brute fact that only a minority of human beings have the combination of natural ability and eagerness which leads them to a cultural use of books. Our limitations in that respect are not due solely to lack of opportunities to use books. The history of libraries in the United States is eloquent of that fact. There are, it is true, large parts of the country most inadequately served by libraries. But in general, our library supply has far outrun library demand. The A. L. A. surveys estimate that, after all that has been done to offer library service to our people, not much more than one-fourth of the people who are richly served by libraries actually make use of them.[1] Whilst library enthusiasts are crying out over the lack of library facilities for one-third of our total population, they seem not to appreciate the significance of the neglect of libraries by nearly three-fourths of the people who have excellent library facilities.

---

[1] C. B. Joeckel, *Library Service,* U. S. Gov't. Printing Office, 1938, p. 6.

That neglect of libraries is not confined to the poor and the under-privileged. It is as noticeable in our colleges as in our city slums. Thus, for example, it is estimated by teachers in graduate schools that four-fifths or better of their graduate students need strong pressure to get them to read well. They enter upon graduate work because they need additional degrees to qualify for promotions, chiefly in teaching positions, and would be delighted if they could get the degrees without the work. Their use of the library is as rigorously conditioned by the compulsion of getting a degree as that of the general run of undergraduates. Again, in one university college, of class A standing, with a well-equipped and attractively housed library, a survey of the current library use showed that only 27% of the faculty members make use of the library even to an extent comparable with the average borrowings of the undergraduate students. In the same college library, a study of the use of reserve collections during the four years, 1930-1934, gave results which may be summarized in these round figure approximations: somewhat less than one-third of the reserve collections were fully used, that is, every book borrowed by some student in the group for which the reserve collection was set up; a little more than one-fourth of the collections were scarcely used at all, that is, less than one in twenty of the books ever left the shelves; the use of the rest of the reserve collections was scattered between these extremes. Illustrations such as these are only straws in the wind; but they *are* straws in the wind.

The major problem of the Catholic librarians with regard to direct reader services is, then, the difficult problem of balance: to reconcile the idealism propagated from the public libraries with the realism inherent in the Catholic tradition. In other words, their problem is to bring into harmony the two elements in their own culture: the Catholic element, derived from Catholic teaching and tradition; and the element infiltrating from the non-Catholic world about them, derived from the perfectionist theories of Bacon and Rousseau. How they are to solve that problem, it is not the task of this book even to suggest. To hint that, following the class-room method of teaching the teachables, it might be intelligent library practice to supply the book demands of those who are willing to use books would almost certainly be offensive to the present popular theory of intellectual democracy, which insists that, given libraries enough, we are all mentally and morally capable of profiting by them. In actual fact, the Catholic librarians are solving this problem, not in any uniform way, but in a variety of ways: that is, in a variety of the measures in which they combine the Catholic attitude with the secular temper of mind.

4. Some Problems of Detail

If the Catholic librarian has intelligently mapped out for himself his general policy with regard to the library services he can offer directly to the readers, he has in that policy the best aid possible for solving the problems of detail that crop up in his relations with his readers. As a matter of fact, one reason why these detailed problems are so difficult for many librarians is precisely that they have never worked out a general policy of reader serivce. It is that general policy that enables the librarian to plan the amount of free access to the books which he can grant, to assess reader demand as a guide in selecting and purchasing books and as a suggestion for subject headings in his catalogue, to establish his quantity limits and time limits on library loans, and to manage all the external relations of the library for the best all-round service of his readers. However, we shall here briefly touch upon a few of the details of relations with readers, rather as illustrations of how they are affected by the general policy of the library than as problems to be solved in a book.

Many librarians would at least greet with raised eyebrows the idea of even discussing the "open shelf" policy at this late date. They consider it a closed question, unanimously decided in favor of the readers' having free access to the books. But in Catholic libraries the question is still very much debatable. The debate hinges, however, not on the flat alternative between open and closed shelves, but on the extent to which readers in a library should have free access to the books. That there should be an open shelf collection of books for ready reference is as generally conceded and practiced by Catholic librarians as by other librarians. Beyond that, there are advantages and disadvantages in the open shelf policy.

For instance, with open shelves, the reader who knows definitely what he wants, has no delay in getting to the books, no fumbling with a catalogue and call slips; but he does not know what books are temporarily gone from the shelves, in circulation. In Catholic libraries, there may be books useful for mature teachers but not suitable to be put into the hands of immature students, which cannot be shelved where the students have free access. The problem of theft, inevitably (as experience shows) connected with open shelves, can be lightly considered by public libraries and wealthy university libraries; it looms mountainous for the Catholic libraries, usually oppressed by poverty. The same may be said of the added work caused by readers' misplacing books on the shelves. Each librarian will have to weigh these and other arguments for and against, and make his own decision about the extent to which students can have free access to the shelves. Faculty members are in another category. Their needs, or at least their position, may ordinarily call for unrestricted access to the book collection, or even to the lifting of all limitations upon their use of books.

It is worth remarking that, with the benefits and drawbacks of the open shelf policy for general readers so nearly cancelling each other out, the strongest argument in favor of open shelves is, for many librarians, the promotional value of the practice. It flatters readers to have the red-tape of borrowing procedure cut away for them; and actual sight of the books may arouse their curiosity and create a desire to read them. But the force of that argument is greater in public libraries than in school libraries; and, in both, the curiosity is likely to be limited to "the latest book."

That concentration of interest upon the latest book creates another minor problem for Catholic libraries. The commercial log-rolling, the mutual admiration reviewing, nowadays so feverishly employed to push the sale of books, stimulate the craving for novelty characteristic of our restless age. "It is a very good thing for authors," as Douglas Woodruff remarks, "that women, who do most of the current reading, have a prejudice against anything old, or modern authors would be left to compete on their merits with the previous centuries."[1] Much appeal to readers is made, not on the merits of a book, but only in its being new. Certainly no one would wish to take the bread out of the mouths of living authors; but the kindly purpose of feeding them is not the whole duty of libraries.

---

[1] *The Tablet*, London, 172:150. (30 July, 1938.)

There is something tragic in our modern preoccupation with books of the moment. It means, in so many cases, that the readers are intellectually *déracinés,* men without anchorage in the cultural inheritance and cultural traditions of mankind. Public libraries may have to cater to that sort of reader demand. But for a school library to be guided by the readers' superficial curiosity about the latest books is to defeat the primary purpose of liberal education, and to work in with the contemporary ballyhoo that mistakes sophistication for intelligence. The fact that this exclusive concern with "the latest" is inculcated everywhere in what passes for "literary conversation" only constitutes a new difficulty for schools and school libraries; it certainly does not sanction the librarian's acquiescing in the fashion.

Quite another thing is the readers' desire to know of new acquisitions by the library, which, in an intelligently conducted library, do not necessarily mean newly published books. The library catalogue will inform the readers about these new acquisitions when the readers know enough to look for new accessions at least under their subject. But it is often desirable to offer this information to readers in some more compact and comprehensive way, which will save the readers time and effort. How this is to be done will depend upon the size of the library, the number of new acquisitions, the facilities for conveying information, the type of readers to be informed, and such like factors. Part of the current techniques of library advertising is to display new books in the reading room, or to call attention to them by posters or the gaudy book-jackets now popular. That practice fits well with a programme of "high-pressuring" readers or luring them with the bait of "the latest." In a school library, lists of new acquisitions, posted weekly or monthly, according to the rate of growth in books, seem to offer a more appropriate method of keeping the readers informed.

The question of how the library is housed has much to do with direct reader service. A reading room of adequate size for the number of readers, properly equipped, lighted, and heated, is obviously in itself a most important form of reader service. Very rarely indeed has the Catholic librarian anything to say about the kind or size of his reading room. He takes what the school officials give him. Within recent years, and largely, it must be confessed, under pressure of one kind or another from without, Catholic schools have made generous efforts to house the library as well as their resources will allow. At times, there is even a little competition about library housing amongst Catholic libraries, and the possible entrance of a spirit of "keeping up with the Joneses." But, as has been said, all that is generally out of the librarian's hands.

Many Catholic schools, because of poverty of resources, or inadequate class room space, or bad management of space in the school buildings, are constrained to use the library reading room for purposes alien to the functions of a library. In some schools, the reading room serves also as a study hall. In others, it is used for debating societies, or special study groups. When these uses are enforced by necessity, there is nothing to do but to accept the situation with a grin. In a few of the larger college libraries there are seminar rooms, which are of problematical value, and which may readily become a source of disturbance to readers in the library. It might seem an imperative principle that their use should always be supervised by a responsible person.

Occasionally, some of the Catholic lady librarians, attracted by the public library notion of advertising, are tempted to welcome to the library, or even to inaugurate, all sorts of pretty ventures in picture displays, book displays, lectures on authors, minor social gatherings. Apparently, also, some women librarians are never content to have a library just a library; they must fill it with some sort of "busy work." In so far as this kind of extraneous activity interferes with the function of the library reading room, which is to furnish the readers with a convenient and undisturbed place for the use of books, it is manifestly bad library practice. Popularizing the librarian is not one of the objectives of library work.

A word must be said about one very useful direct service to the reader, instruction in the use of the library. Every librarian knows the value and need of that instruction. The reader needs it nowadays even in a small library. In the public libraries, the desk attendants have to instruct their patrons as best they can. In school libraries, the value of knowing how to use the library is greater; but in the school there are, or should be, more abundant means of meeting the need. The instruction, without being elaborate, should be extensive enough to enable students to use the card catalogue intelligently, to familiarize them with ready reference tools, the various types of encyclopedias, biographical dictionaries, periodicals indexes and other indexes, bibliopgraphic aids, and the like.

Who should give instruction in the use of the library, is a question of school administration, not of library administration. It is here suggested that such instruction is properly part of the educational work of the junior or senior high school; that it is best done by the teachers, each for a small group, with blackboard illustrations and with actual demonstrations in the library; that it should be given, not in one indigestible lecture at the beginning of a course, but worked in through a succession of assignments calculated to make it assimilable by the students. Since the school library is part of the apparatus of school education, instruction in its use should accompany the instruction which leads to its use. To have the librarian offer instruction in how to use a library is to dissociate the library from the rest of the school. Besides, there are more teachers than librarians, and more opportunities for the teachers than librarians, to instruct students in the use of the library.

It is not proposed here to touch upon all the problems of detail concerning direct reader services. But we may mention, as a last instance, the problem of inter-library loans, one that concerns usually only the larger college libraries. The practice of inter-library loans has recently increased considerably; has, in fact, become so extensive in some libraries that some policy must be determined as to when they should be requested of other libraries, and when granted. Some librarians believe that there has been some abuse of this as of other practices in which reader demand can at times be unreasonable. As a result, some libraries are making a fixed charge for inter-library loans. If the charges are passed on to the reader, it may keep down wanton requests. The practice of inter-library loans is immensely valuable; the good judgment of librarians is needed to see that abuses do not destroy it.

CHAPTER VIII

PROBLEMS OF TRAINING LIBRARIANS

Anyone considering the history of library work must be struck by the profound change in the concept of librarianship which has come about in the course of a single long lifetime. The change may be expressed in a variety of compact phrases, such as a change from the static to the dynamic in librarianship, a change from the librarian as keeper of the books to the librarian as distributor of books. Dr. Bostwick even wrote of it as a change from the librarian as scholar to the librarian as man of affairs.[1] But compact phrases are easily misleading. The changes in the concept of librarianship are not simple, but complex. They involve most significant developments in the whole of our modern culture. Their roots go deeper into economic, social, and religious history than most librarians even suspect. They cannot adequately be summed up in a phrase.

Some hints at least of what that changed concept of librarianship has come to be may, perhaps, be found scattered through what has already been written in this book. Here we must deal with the fact that as the concept of librarianship took on, quite rapidly, new form and content, the notion of how to prepare for librarianship was inevitably bound to undergo corresponding changes. The new librarian was to be charged with functions different from those of the old librarian. He had to be trained, therefore, in a different way. That is, obviously, the rough genesis of the new approach to training librarians. It is easy to sketch an outline of the dates and events that mark stages in this extremely modern development of librarian training. But the dates and facts alone do not tell the story. One must try to have some understanding of the cultural movement back of the surface facts. We shall make a hurried and crude attempt in this chapter to study the significance of the recent changes in training for librarianship, and the problems thereby created for Catholic libraries. It may clear the way, if we begin with an analysis of the art of librarianship.

---

[1] Cf. *Supra*, p. 18.

1. The Art of Librarianship

At first sight, it does not make for clearness to say that librarianship is an art, and that therefore the librarian is an artist. Art and artists are slippery words. Men have been quarreling about their meaning for centuries, and are still quarreling. Eric Gill, for instance, battles valiantly for the wider concept of art: "Art is skill—skill in doing or skill in making . . . Art is deliberate skill—skill with mind behind it[1] . . . The artist is the responsible workman."[2] He insists on the "art" of carpentering, tailoring, bricklaying, and on calling the responsible men who exercise these arts "artists." He infuriates quite a number of people.

Most people limit "art" to what are often called the fine arts, those consciously concerned with making beautiful things. To them sculptors, painters, musicians, are artists; perhaps poets and actors also are artists; scene-painters, and orators, and crooners are doubtfully artists; sign-painters and radio announcers are almost certainly not artists; and house-painters and club raconteurs are absolutely not artists.

In these differences there is a conflict between a philosophical concept, such as Eric Gill's, and a purely conventional concept, such as the common one. Most people think that by giving a conventional meaning to "art" and "artist" as purveyors of beauty, they are evading a bother about definitions. But in reality they are running into a greater problem than defining "art," the problem of defining "beauty." Would common usage sanction speaking of "the art of librarianship"? If it is an art, what kind of art is it?

For we do think and speak, not merely of "art," but of various kinds of arts. There is the art of painting or sculpture; there is also the art of government, the art of war, the art of navigation, the art of teaching, the art of magic, and latterly the very important art of propaganda. We have become familiar with the industrial arts as distinct from the fine arts; although at times we may be hard put to classify ceramic art or textile art in either of the divisions. In which sense is a Gobelin tapestry, a Ming vase, or a Feraghan rug a work of art? Have we never heard of the art of diplomacy, or even its sometimes kindred art of lying? Whistler wrote *The Gentle Art of Making Enemies*; and E. V. Lucas, *The Gentlest Art,* a collection of products of the art of letter-writing.

---

[1] Eric Gill, *Beauty Looks After Herself,* London, 1933, p. 11.
[2] *Ibid.,* p. 187, and *passim.*

Amongst so many arts there seems to be place for the art of librarianship. The dictionary definition ought to cover it, even though the dictionaries illustrate the truth that it is easier to describe an art than to define it. The latter part of Webster's, "skill, dexterity, or the power of performing certain actions, acquired by experience, study, or observation" is a genetic description rather than a definition. But it lends itself readily to including librarianship as "the power of performing certain actions *with books,* acquired by experience, study, or observation." The notion of skill, dexterity, fits in certainly with the modern concept of librarianship. If we fall back on Eric Gill's phrase, librarianship is "skill in doing," not "skill in making," something; but beyond question it is "deliberate skill—skill with mind behind it."

Nor is it a denial of the art of librarianship that we have come to speak a great deal about "library science." From time immemorial, men have recognized, it is true, a distinction, sometimes even an opposition, between art and science; and often artists and scientists do not get along well together. The artist is inclined to think the scientist a gaunt, dry, meagre fellow; and the scientist to look upon the artist as sloppy, sentimental, and inaccurate. Yet art and science can work in the same field. There is a science of war as well as an art of war. Some people think that there is a science of education as well as the art of education. It is not inexplicable that we have both "library science" and the art of librarianship.

The elements of science in library work are the established general rules, not as rigid as the laws of physics or chemistry, not primarily quantitative at all, yet having some share of that exactitude and coherence which we have come to associate with the positive sciences. We may at least bravely say that "library science" is as verifiably a science as psychology or sociology. Cutter's *Rules for a Dictionary Catalogue* is, within a recognizable extension of terms, a scientific work. The laws formulated as "principles" in expanding an outline of library classification, even though they are purely artificial, have a scientific consistency. It is part of our modern temper to be enamored of the very name, "science"; hence many modern librarians have emphasized the "scientific" side of library work.

But all this "library science" is only part of the apparatus of the art of librarianship. Library science is a tool for use in librarianship. It is like a brush to a painter or chisel to a sculptor. Far from there being any opposition between library science and the art of librarianship, there is implied in the two concepts the fellowship between the workman and his tools.

Library science has in recent years been much elaborated, has become more complex. The very multiplicity of rules has made for an increased rigidity, a closer approximation to the mechanical element in scientific ways of doing things. One might compare the modern library science with the older methods used in libraries, much as one would compare, say, the air-brush with the old plain camel's hair or sable or bristle. One may also find amongst librarians varied appreciations of the way in which library science has developed, just as one may find amongst painters attachments to old or new techniques in painting. But old ways, or new ways, simple or complex, flexible or rigid, they are all means to an end. The test of their excellence is their usefulness in the art of librarianship.

2. Librarians as Artists

Librarians may, then, be looked upon as men who practice an art: the art of selecting, arranging, and managing books to serve the uses of readers. In that limited and special sense they may be considered artists, "responsible workmen," men of skill, "deliberate skill—skill with mind behind it." Their equipment as artists may reasonably be analyzed, just as the equipment of other artists, into these three elements: native ability, talent, aptitude, whatever one wishes to call it; education, physical, mental, and moral maturity; and technical skills, facility in command of the tools of librarianship. One might be tempted to add a fourth element: virtue, at the very least the intellectual virtue of modesty, and fortitude in the form of patience, remembering how conceit and intolerance can destroy the usefulness of any amount of talent and skill. But virtue is, after all, included in education.

Talent, maturity of knowledge and of virtue, technical skill, some measure of all these is absolutely necessary for competency as a librarian. There are obviously many degrees of these qualities amongst librarians; and only a high degree of them, great talent, great educational maturity, great skill, can make a great librarian. We may also at once concede that great librarians are as scarce in history or in contemporary life as great painters or great teachers or great statesmen. The lowest measures of these gifts and acquirements may leave their possessor on the indistinguishable border of incompetency. Somewhere between the highest and the lowest all librarians deserving the name must range.

The particular kind of talent or native ability needed for librarianship is varied. History has shown its range to be wide. Some librarians have had the imagination and constructive ability to make them competent literary artists. But mostly the talent needed and effectively displayed has been of what we may honestly call a more stodgy sort: good memory, the emotional balance underlying calm judgment, the capacity for industry and for working with others. Good librarians have, for the most part, been patient sloggers.

The educational development needed for librarianship is even more varied; but we think of it as chiefly embracing wide knowledge of books, some critical equipment for judging books, strengthened habits of industry, of accuracy in recalling, of orderliness of mind, and at least enough sense of humor to give one perspective and keep one's judgment from getting befogged.

The technical skills needed in librarianship have become more and more numerous, and include a long array of practices involving a close co-ordination of methodical details to be worked into library routines. These practices, derived from much trial and error, are now established as tested procedure. In spite of their wealth of detail, they serve for the organization of the few and simple library functions which have always been the essentials of library work; the selection and acquisition of books; the classification, shelving, identification, and cataloguing of books; the construction of bibliographic aids; and the circulation of books.

The size of some book collections, the complexities of reader service, and the multiplication of library records are the chief causes of the increased detail in library techniques: and they are causes which obviously are not operative in every library.

It should not be necessary to say that the foundation for education and technical skills is the bedrock of native ability. Education, technical training, can do no more than develop the latent possibilities of one's inherited powers. Whilst it is true that few men ever do actuate their possibilities, through education, to anything approaching completeness, it is also true that native limitations are inescapable limitations. The old proverb about sows' ears and silk purses offends the self-conceit of many persons whose ambition outruns their ability, and annoys some of the sentimental propounders of intellectual democracy; but it still makes good sense. The man or woman with a weak inheritance in power of memory, neurotically incapable of sustained work, emotionally unbalanced in judgment, cannot become a good librarian. That is so obvious that it is a truism; yet it is amazing how many persons in practice do not believe it. Education and training are indispensable for librarianship; they can work wonders with good material; they can do little with poor material.

3. Education for Librarianship

As far back as our knowledge of librarians reaches, the competent librarian had to be both a scholar and an organizer; but the amount of emphasis upon each of these qualifications has varied a good deal between remote and recent history. In the Alexandrian librarians, for instance, critical scholarship seems to have been more highly valued than skill in arranging books,[1] although even the nebulous Callimachus and Aristonymus are accepted as originators of a scheme of library classification.

There are tantalizing glimpses in Cicero's letters of his librarian Tyrannio, a captive slave, whom Cicero honored as an author,[1] and whom he made tutor to his son as well as librarian. Tyrannio is an expert in selecting and buying books;[2] he is classifying and labelling Cicero's books with the aid of two slaves borrowed from Atticus.[3] When the job is done, Cicero writes to Atticus: "Since Tyrannio has arranged my books, the house seems to have acquired a soul: and your Dionysius and Menophilus were of extraordinary service. Nothing could be more charming than those bookcases of yours now that the books are adorned with title-slips."[4] This sounds a little pretty-pretty, it is true; but it evidences an appreciation of library arrangement, to balance his appreciation of Tyrannio as a scholar.

---

[1] See Edward Edwards' *Memoirs of Libraries*, London, 1859, I, 23-24, for Vitruvius' story about the appointment of Aristophanes as librarian of the Brucheion at Alexandria.

But there are no indications as to how the early librarians acquired their scholarship and their skill in library management. When Cicero asks to borrow from Atticus "*de tuis librariolis duos aliquos*," any couple of fellows from your library assistants, there is a suggestion that there existed something like an apprenticeship in library work. But those two *librarioli* were explicitly asked for only to glue pages together and do odd jobs. They do not impress one as future chief librarians. Their apprenticeship sounds a little bit like a perpetual library assistantship.[5] The general impression one gets from reading of librarians in the classical, the mediaeval,[6] and the renaissance periods, indeed up to the most recent times, is that men who were already scholars became librarians by observation and imitation of the library techniques already in use, and that for the most part that observation of library methods was done from the outside, as reader and student, not as a library assistant or apprentice. Later, they themselves might add to library techniques as a result of their own experience, their own trial and error.

---

[1] *Ad Atticum*, XII, 2, 6. (In Loeb Classics, *Cicero's Letters to Atticus*, with English translation by E. O. Winstedt, 3 vols., 1912-1918; III, 6, 16. See also *Ibid.*, 124-125.)

[2] *Ad Quintum Fratrem*, II, 4, 6; III, 4, 5-6. (In E. S. Shuckburgh, *Letters of Cicero*, 4 vols., London, 1908-1912; I, 219, 309, 330.)

[3] *Ad Atticum*, IV, 4a, 5. (In Loeb Classics, Winstedt ed., I, 280-282, 284.)

[4] *Ad Atticum*, IV, 8. (Winstedt's translation, I, 292.)

[5] For an interesting account of the *librarii* and of Atticus, see G. H. Putnam, *Authors and their Public in Ancient Times*, New York, 1894; pp. 183 sqq. On p. 197, he writes of the work of the *librarii* as binders.

[6] For the mediaeval librarians, see John Willis Clark, *The Care of Books*, Cambridge, 1902, pp. 53 sqq.

Thus, Gabriel Naudé (1600-1653) was a student of medicine when, at twenty years of age, he interrupted his studies because of poverty to take charge of the private library of Henri de Mesmes. He saved enough money from his stipend to go on to Padua in 1626 and finish his medical studies. When he came back to Paris, the next year, he showed the results of his library experience in his *Advis pour Dresser une Bibliothèque.* But it was his discourse on the antiquity and glory of the Paris Faculty of Medicine, delivered in 1628, which won him fame, and led to his appointment by Cardinal Bagni as his physician and librarian at Rome. He held that position, a minor one as librarians went in those days, for twelve years, during which he increased his scholarship and his wide acquaintance with books. Richelieu brought him back to Paris in 1641, where he began a dispute with the Benedictines, over the authorship of *De Imitatione Christi,* that lasted eleven years, Naudé defending Thomas á Kempis against Gerson. In the meantime Richelieu died, in 1642, and Cardinal Mazarin, who ambitioned gathering together a great library, took over Naudé as his librarian. In the eleven years that remained until his death in 1653, Naudé built up the superb Mazarin Library by purchases throughout Europe. Of the nine chapters of his Plan for Organizing a Library more than half are taken up with the selection and purchase of books. The seventh chapter contains his scheme of library classification, the eighth deals with bookbinding. Naudé had the kind of talent needed for librarianship; by study and experience he got the knowledge and training to make of himself an excellent librarian.

Jean Garnier (1612-1681) was a Jesuit priest, who went through the usual schooling of members of his order, taught literature and philosophy at the college of Clermont, and theology at Bourges. He had been a Jesuit for fifty years when he published his *Systema Bibliothecae Collegii Parisiensis Societatis Jesu,* one of the foundation works in modern library classification. He was the author of works on theology, church history, and patristic literature, several of which were published only after his death. He took his librarianship in his stride, as part of a much larger programme of work.

Ismael Boulliau (1605-1694), who shares with Garnier the credit of devising the "French System" of library classification, was an astronomer, the son of an astronomer. Of a dozen or so of his books published between 1638 and 1682, nine are on astronomy. His *Catalogus Bibliothecae Thuanae* was published when he was seventy-four years old.

A contemporary of these two, Antonio Magliabecchi (1633-1714), a man of amazing erudition, had a career that seemed even less likely than theirs to lead to librarianship. Left an orphan at an early age, he kept a little shop on the Ponte Vecchio at Florence until he was forty years old. Without the aid of schools, he had set himself, from the age of sixteen, to study at night and to master Latin, Greek, and Hebrew, the fundamentals of scholarship until only yesterday. Ermini, the librarian of Cardinal Leopoldo dei Medici, discovered his immense knowledge of books and led to his being assigned, under Marmi, to build up a library for Cosimo III. He was as odd as he was learned, a dried up little man, encrusted with snuff. His stipend went mostly for books, with which he filled every nook and cranny of his house, and across which his spiders "that he loved as much as he hated the Jesuits" spun their webs unmolested. His friends constantly made him the butt of jokes. Perhaps it was even a jest that Francesco Berettari dedicated to him in 1681 his elegiac poem on the death of Godefroy Henschen, the Bollandist, and Jean Garnier, both Jesuits.[1]

David Hume (1711-1776), after his studies at Edinburgh University, was disappointed in his hopes of a professorship. He published in 1739-1740 the three volumes of his *Treatise on Human Nature,* which was completely ignored, and in 1741 the first volume of his *Essays,* which was a success. But still the professorial chair eluded him. After various secretarial jobs, he became librarian of the Advocates' Library at Edinburgh in 1752, when he was forty-one years old. He used his opportunity of the good library to begin his *History of England.*

Even the great Gotthold Ephraim Lessing (1729-1781), when his plays and his *Laokoon* (1766) had brought him more fame than money, settled down gratefully as the Prince of Brunswick's librarian at Wolfenbüttel, and spent the last twelve years of his life in that position. It was not an uncommon close to a career of scholarship, in the long centuries when scholarship was the major part of librarianship.

---

[1] *Nouvelle Biographie Générale,* XXXII: 706-709.

Thus also, Jean-Baptiste Cotton des Houssayes (1727-1783), one of the first to write about the "Duties and Qualifications of a Librarian,"[1] taught theology at Rouen for many years before he became, at the age of fifty, librarian at the Sorbonne.

One of the greatest of English librarians, Sir Anthony Panizzi (1797-1879) was an Italian lawyer, who fled to England as a political exile when he was twenty-five years old, lived for the next nine years by teaching Italian, then, through the political influence of Brougham, was appointed an assistant librarian in the British Museum. Six years later, he became Keeper of Printed Books, and in 1856, when he was nearly sixty years old, Principal Librarian. He began his preparation for librarianship after he had entered upon library work.

Of a formal preparation for librarianship we see little or nothing in the men who are the true founders of modern library techniques. Incessant study joined to a retentive memory, through which they acquired an encyclopedic sort of knowledge, was their chief preparation. Scholarship came first in their equipment as librarians; technical skill apparently was picked up on the way.

But as the nineteenth century advanced, libraries began to multiply, and a few of them, such as the library of the British Museum and the Bibliothèque Nationale, began to be very large. There were not enough scholars to go round; and, more importantly, there was a good deal of almost mechanical routine work which irked scholars, and for which a trained assistant was more useful than a scholar. The libraries developed a practical need for journeymen hands who might never become master craftsmen in the art of librarianship. These librarians did not need to be scholars; it was required of them chiefly that they be competent mechanics in the supervised detail work of the libraries.

In the larger libraries there had always been a place for some of these minor librarians. Occasionally one or other of them would, by study and self-training, rise to the position of a chief librarian, either in the library in which he had passed his apprenticeship or in a newly founded library.[1] But most of them, just as most minor librarians today, remained for all their lives minor librarians.

---

[1] Translated in Dana and Kent, *Literature of Libraries in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries,* 6 vols., Chicago, 1906; vol. I.

What became significant in the course of the nineteenth century was the growing number of these minor librarians, for whom the library techniques were the beginning and end of their library work. In the art of librarianship, they may be compared with the studio assistants of the great painters, men who might swing as perfect a circle with a piece of chalk as the legendary circle of Giotto, but who never became Giottos. The need to train such minor librarians in technical skills was one of the major causes that brought about the modern development of education for librarianship.

But that was not the sole cause of the change in librarian training. An even more important cause was the striking development of the library techniques themselves, consequent in great part upon the growth in size of libraries, and beginning to manifest itself shortly after the middle of the nineteenth century. In the United States, Charles Coffin Jewett (1816-1868) may be said to mark the turning-point in that development.

Jewett's own education for librarianship was unusual in one respect. After graduating at the age of nineteen from Brown University, a small college with less than two hundred students, he taught school, studied theology with foreign missionary work in view, then, at twenty-six, became librarian at Brown. Here, in 1843, he made the first advance toward the idea of a dictionary catalogue, antedating Crestadoro of Manchester.[2] The unusual part of his training came through his being sent to Europe in 1843, for two years, at the expense of John Carter Brown (whose famous collection of early Americana came to Brown University some fifty-five years later), to visit libraries, observe library practices, and buy books.

---

[1] An instance in point is Edward Edwards (1812-1886), who learned librarianship by working under Panizzi in the Library of the British Museum. He became the first librarian of the Manchester Free Library in 1850, two years before it opened for use, was dismissed in 1858, and in the following year published his *Memoirs of Libraries.*

[2] C. A. Cutter, "Library Catalogues," in *Public Libraries in the United States of America.* U. S. Bureau of Education, 1876, Part I, pp. 538-539.

On his return, for some reason or other, he lost his position as librarian at Brown University, and went back to teaching for the next three years. But in 1848 he secured a place as librarian in the newly founded Smithsonian Institution, under Joseph Henry, who sanctioned the publication by the Smithsonian, in 1851, of Jewett's *Notices of Public Libraries in the United States of America,* the first attempt at a survey of our libraries. But Henry dismissed him three years later, because Jewett was trying to turn the Smithsonian into a reference library. He was almost immediately employed in another newly established library, the Boston Public Library, of which he became head in 1858.

Jewett projected large developments of cataloguing, envisaging a universal union catalogue; and was the first to advocate and practice the policy of open access to book shelves. He carried on in the United States the movement begun in England by such men as Edward Edwards for the promotion of libraries by various governmental agencies. From his time onward one notes the growth of public libraries and the increasing refinements of library methods.

Melvil Dewey's widely accepted *Decimal Classification* and Cutter's *Rules for a Dictionary Catalogue* made definite the tendency to more elaborate and more systematic work in classifying and cataloguing libraries, and set up model procedures in which any reasonably intelligent young person, not at all a scholar, could be trained. The inevitable result of these developments in technical library methods was to give technical skills a greater prominence in the eyes of librarians than they ever had before. Scholarship was still a part of the equipment of a great librarian; but for the host of minor librarians the essential preparation for library work became, more and more, training in library techniques. A shift of emphasis such as this, affecting by far the larger number of librarians, was bound to have an immense effect upon the whole concept of education for librarianship.

Still another cause worked in with the growth of libraries, the increased number of library assistants, and the growing preoccupation with library techniques, to give further impetus to this change in education for librarianship. That very powerful cause was the wave of enthusiasm, carried over from the recent entry of the State into the business of school education, for the use of books as the most important instruments of popular education. What had been the field of men with aptitude and desire for scholarship was to become the training ground of whole nations. Democracy was to be built upon literacy. Political, economic, and social salvation was to come by books.

That enthusiam was caught up violently by most of the librarians. For many of them, it is no exaggeration to say that it took on something of the character of a religion. It was part of the ritual of humanitarianism, that cult of a material improvement of life on this earth into which, during the nineteenth century, Protestantism so largely broke down. Carlyle had called public libraries "the peoples' university," a phrase that appealed to the nebulous ideas of democracy growing out of the French Revolution. Many librarians were willing to make public libraries the peoples' temples as well. It was a sincere and almost fanatic zeal. But since even the most zealous librarians were still human, zeal for the spread of libraries lent itself easily to a glorification of the librarian's job, to magnifying the technical skills of librarians, and thence to an insistence upon special training in techniques for librarians.

Add to all this the temper of adulation for all things "scientific" which characterized the nineteenth century, the beginnings of professional and trade organization of librarians (of which more in the next chapter), the natural growth of a caste spirit amongst librarians, their taking themselves very seriously as cultural leaders, the tendency toward regimentation already appearing in school systems, and it becomes easy to see how a definite movement for a universal formal training of librarians would gather enormous momentum.

4. The Coming of the Library Schools

It is, of course, a fact that all the essential developments of library practice were the work of men who had not been trained in library schools. In the case of the earlier devisers of library methods, there were no library schools for them to attend. Apparently, the first regularly organized school for instruction in library methods was that set up by Melvil Dewey, in 1887, at Columbia University.[1] Four more similar schools were begun in the United States before the close of the nineteenth century.[2] Now library schools have become so numerous that there is question of their overloading the market with the students they turn out, and the process of regimenting them has become a major concern of the American Library Association.

The section of this chapter just preceding the present has, perhaps, sufficiently indicated why education for librarianship should have become a formal procedure. Granted the impulsion toward formal training in library work, there were two ways of imparting that training. One was the way of apprenticeship, the ancient way of the arts and crafts, in which the master instructed the beginner; the way that, in point of fact, had actually been followed in library training even through most of the nineteenth century. That way is still in use. Indeed, it can never cease to be in use, since even the graduates of a library school must afterward serve an apprenticeship in some library. But apprenticeship alone did not suit the ambitions and the social tendencies of American librarians. The Americans have become, in the past sixty years or so, a people who worship schools. To us, *education* and *school* are complete synonyms. Hence, the second way of formal training for librarians, through instruction in a school, became quite naturally the more attractive way for American librarians.

As this little study deals with the library situation in the United States, we are not immediately concerned with library schools in other countries. We need, therefore, only say in passing that Karl Dziatzko began lecturing on library methods at the University of Gottingen in 1886; that the first Summer School of Library Science in England was opened in 1893, and the first regular course in 1898, both under the auspices of the

---

[1] The claim has been made by some writers that Friedrich Ritschl, librarian at the University of Bonn, had organized a library school as early as 1861. Dr. Tse-Chien Tai, in *Professional Education for Librarianship*, New York, 1925, pp. 115-118, makes out a strong case against this claim.

[2] Pratt Institute, Brooklyn, 1890; Drexel Institute, Philadelphia, 1892; Armour Institute, Chicago, 1893 (transferred to the University of Illinois in 1897); and Syracuse University, 1897.

(British) Library Association; that in France the Sorbonne began offering lectures in library methods in 1894, but that a full-fledged school was not opened until 1924, organized and conducted by the American Library Association. American librarians boast of having led the way; but formal training for librarians was in the air in Europe long before the Americans took it up, was suggested by Martin Schrettinger in Munich as early as 1829,[1] and later foreshadowed in government examinations for librarianship, in Austria from 1862 onward, in Italy since 1876, in France since 1879.

By 1910, Dr. Bostwick was able to classify the formal training agencies for librarianship in the United States as of three sorts: the complete library schools; summer school courses; and training classes conducted by libraries.[2] This division still holds good today, but with an increasing tendency to strengthen the position of the full library schools, at the expense of summer courses and training classes. The study programmes and admission requirements of the library schools tend to become more ambitious in their extension, in the competitive fashion so characteristic of American schools of all sorts.

It would be instructive to compare the development of the American library schools with that of the law schools and medical schools, which as influential training agencies antedate the library schools by a generation. The methods of propaganda, the virulence shown toward other training agencies, the struggle for dominance and assertion of regulating authority amongst the schools, the mixture of genuine idealism with love of power, the commercial element of competing standards and entrance requirements, have a curious parallel in all these technical schools. But there is not space in this brief book to make the full comparison. One point only we may touch upon lightly.

When schools for the formal training of lawyers and physicians were begun in the United States, law and medicine had already long been accepted as professions, and lawyers and physicians were universally recognized as professional men. But a quarter of a century after the establishment of the first library school, Dr. Bostwick felt compelled to open his chapter on "Training for Librarianship" with this statement: "Whether librarianship has yet arrived at the dignity of a profession is a moot point."[1] It had not been a moot point to Naudé or Magliabecchi, to Panizzi, Jewett, or Poole; nor, at the time when Dr. Bostwick was writing, was it a moot point to Ehrle or Achille Ratti.[2] The moot point is whether or not the American library schools had begun to introduce more of the trade element than of the professional element into American librarianship. It was scholarship that gave to the great librarians their professional standing, in the United States as in other countries. But one suspects that, even after fifty years of library schools, the clamor of the multitude of minor librarians to be considered "professional" librarians is both unconvincing, and so far, unheeded.

---

[1] Martin Schrettinger, *Versuch eines vollständigen Lehrbuchs der Bibliothek-Wissenschaft,* 2 vols., Munich, 1829. See especially vol. II, pp. 187-196.

[2] Arthur E. Bostwick, *The American Public Library,* New York, 1910; pp. 330-332.

In 1915, ten of the library schools banded themselves into "The Association of American Library Schools," and set themselves up as a standardizing agency for other library schools. In 1916, the American Library Association appointed a Committee on Standardization of Libraries and Certification of Librarians. Six years later, in 1922, when the Association of American Library Schools had included thirteen schools, it merged with the American Library Association. Various committees of the A. L. A. dealing with the certification and training of librarians finally evolved, in 1924, into the Board of Education for Librarianship. In 1933, the A. L. A. adopted the standards set up by this Board for three types of library schools: type I, those that offered to students with a bachelor degree more than one year of library science; type II, those that, still requiring a first degree for admission, offered only one year of library instruction; type III, those that offered one year of work, without requiring a degree for admission.[1] In the 1937 *Handbook,* 27 library schools were "accredited" by the Board, 25 of them in the United States, 2 in Canada: 5 of type I, 13 of type II, 9 of type III. Of the library schools in types II and III, three were marked as "accredited for training school librarians." One of the library schools of type III is conducted by a Catholic college.[2]

---

[1] *The American Public Library*, ch. XXIII, p. 330.

[2] Franz Ehrle, (1845-1934) studied in the Jesuit school at Feldkirch, entered the Jesuit novitiate when he was sixteen, and followed the usual course of studies and teaching of the Jesuits, doing his theology in England. As a Jesuit student, he was a part-time assistant librarian. After ordination, his chief work was writing a history of scholasticism and studies of the Franciscans and Dominicans in connection with scholasticism. His connection with the Vatican Library began in 1890, when he published the first volume of his *Historia Bibliothecae Romanorum Pontificum.* In 1895, he was appointed Vice-Prefect, and in 1896 Prefect, of the Vatican Library. In 1912, Msgr. Ratti, who had been on the staff of the Ambrosian Library for twenty-four years, and had been Prefect of the Ambrosian for five years, was assigned as Ehrle's Vice-Prefect, and, at Ehrle's request, was made Prefect in 1914, an office he held for four years until he was sent as Apostolic Visitor to Poland. In 1921, Msgr. Ratti became Cardinal Archbishop of Milan, and was elected Pope, as Pius XI, 6 February, 1922. The new Pope made Ehrle a Cardinal, 11 December, 1922, and in 1929 named him, at the age of eighty-four, successor to Cardinal Gasquet as Librarian and Archivist of the Holy Roman Church. (R. M. Huber, "Francis Cardinal Ehrle, S.J." in *The Catholic Historical Review*, 20; 175-184, July 1934.) A recent reviewer of a group of biographies of Pius XI protests that the biographers "claim an undue pre-eminence for him as a scholar. All the historical and paleographical articles of the former Msgr. Ratti which I have read give evidence of sound and painstaking rather than brilliant scholarship. His predecessor in the Vatican Library, Cardinal Ehrle, and his successor in the Ambrosiana, Msgr. Galbiati . . . are both more eminent in the history of librarianship." (*Studies*, 27:498, September, 1938.)

There can be no question whatever of the earnest desire of the American Library Association to improve the quality of librarians' preparation for library work. What can be questioned, and by many is questioned, is the effective means it uses to secure that improvement. Prescinding from the debatable aim for library work set up by the Association, which Arundell Esdaile, head of the British Museum, characterized as the exploitation of books,[3] and which departs abruptly from the centuries-old tradition of libraries, the methods of the A. L. A. may be criticized as an unfortunate borrowing from the regimentation technique employed by other "standardizing agencies" of American schools.

That technique of standardization sins by impatience. It cannot wait for the slow and natural evolution of school organization and methods, by which they are gradually adapted to the inevitable changes in national cultures. It insists upon forcing the pace of development by compulsion of one sort or another,

[1] *Bulletin of the A. L. A.,* 27:610. (15 December, 1933.)
[2] *Bulletin of the A. L. A.,* 31:H61-H62. (November, 1937.)
[3] *Bulletin of the A. L. A.,* 27:573. (December, 1933.)

by a process of regimentation which imposes new forms of organization upon schools, new methods of teaching and training, and that, quite frequently, before those methods have been adequately tested by time and experience. It is the technique of people who are in a desperate hurry, and who think that a couple of years of study by a Committee is ample substitute for the cultural maturity of centuries.

It is a strange and most significant fact that as the peoples of the various Protestant cultures have progressively rejected the idea of religious authority, and have substituted "private judgment" for authoritative teaching in matters concerning our eternal destiny and the means of achieving it, they have more and more turned to the exercise of authority by secular organizations, have multiplied fiats of coercion and repression, from the Puritan "Blue Laws," through compulsory school laws, to Prohibition. The Catholic accepts, as from God, an exact regimentation in his religious beliefs and practices; he is inclined to be a staunch individualist in all that lies beyond that spiritual domain. The Protestant, freed from religious authority, seems to make up for that lack by social, economic, and educational compulsions. The Catholic culture has been taught through the centuries to look upon the details of work, including by all means library work, *sub specie aeternatis*; the non-Catholic culture, with its eyes upon the swiftly moving panorama of life on this earth, must be intolerant of delay, must manipulate the passing moment, even with violence if need be, because its vision scarcely extends beyond the passing moment.

The whole of the modern apparatus of training librarians is still in the experimental stage. Its value in improving the quality of librarians and their work in libraries cannot be adequately judged by us, here and now, because we are standing with our noses against the picture. Time is the tester of such educational changes as those involved in the modern library movement, particularly as it has manifested itself in the United States. The clamorous enthusiasm of those who conduct or regiment library schools means nothing at all as an evaluation of the worth of library schools. The opinions of those who have employed the graduates of library schools may have a little more weight; but they too must be accepted with caution.

When Dr. Bostwick, for instance, seventeen years after the beginning of library schools, commented upon the fact that few heads of the large libraries were products of a library school,[1] he might be answered by saying that he spoke too soon. In any case, the number of library school graduates who succeeded in gaining good positions in libraries is not the ultimate criterion of advance in the education of librarians. The further fact that some of the heads of libraries have found graduates of library schools inclined to be cocky, to assume an eminence in librarianship that was not substantiated by the work they did, is again not a final verdict on the effectiveness of library schools; it may be only an illustration of the ebullience of youth and inexperience.

Nor is it fair to expect too much of library schools. Mankind has known for many centuries the limitations of schools of any sort. School education is only a groundwork for that more important part of education that forever transcends schools. Schools are a short-cut in the slow transmission of knowledge and skills from the mature to the immature; their chief function, as such, is to point out what the student has to learn when he leaves school. Education for library work, like all other education, is essentially self-education; whether or not it begins in a school is less important than that it should continue all through one's life. But it is a bad library school, a bad any sort of school, that sends its graduates out ignorant of their limitations and their need of continued self-education.

5. Catholic Library Schools

As has already been noted, Catholic libraries in the United States were slow in matching the changes in the non-Catholic libraries. Some of the reasons for that delay have also been touched upon: chiefly, the comparative poverty of Catholic libraries, and their lack of full accord with the hopes, ambitions, and plans that moved the non-Catholic libraries. In accepting the changed attitude toward librarian training, Catholic librarians, for pretty much the same reasons, lagged still farther in the rear of the aggressive American movement.

[1] A. E. Bostwick, *Library Essays*, New York, 1920; p. 95.

But it would have been against human nature for the Catholic librarians to hold back indefinitely against the strong propaganda for the formal training of librarians. They were slow and reluctant to take up with the new ideas of education for librarianship, which stressed technical skills as against scholarship, book salesmanship as against the traditional conservative policies of libraries, and which made library schools the supreme agencies of librarian education; but they were not adamant against these very new and very compelling concepts. Gradually, the Catholic librarians began yielding to the new ideas in librarian education. It is of note that they began to yield more unmistakably around 1920, about the time when the pressure of the "standardizing agencies" was beginning to be acutely felt in the Catholic colleges and high schools.

It is extremely important, when considering the attitude of Catholic librarians toward training for library work, to keep in mind such facts as these: that the primary urge to the spread of formal training of librarians came through the needs and aspirations of the large public libraries, with their increasing number of minor librarians and their multiplied direct reader services; and that the Catholic libraries were almost wholly school libraries, not public libraries, and that very few of them were troubled by the difficulties in organization and administration which size and complexity of services create in large libraries. As late as 1929, only six Catholic libraries claimed to have 100,000 or more volumes;[1] in 1938, there were ten, including one library that claimed a rather vague 200,000, and another that claimed 300,000 volumes.[2] The bulk of the 3,000 Catholic libraries are still, overwhelmingly, small libraries.

In these small Catholic libraries, with the simpler demands of a school clientele, it was the women librarians who first showed a sensitive response to the enthusiasm for formal training of librarians, and for library schools. That fact has a natural connection with the feminist influence running through the recent library movement in the United States. Library work has become very largely an employment of women.[1] The contrast between the scholarly stodginess of the old libraries and the charming fussiness of the new libraries is a contrast between the ways of the crusty male and those of the light and tripping female.

---

[1] *Statistics of Public, Society, and School Libraries, 1929.* Office of Education. Bulletin 37, 1930. Table 10.

[2] From correspondence with Catholic librarians.

As a result of the interest in library science shown by some of the Catholic teaching Sisters, the first course in library methods to be offered in an American Catholic college was given in the Summer School of 1918, at the University of Notre Dame, under the direction of the librarian, The Reverend Paul J. Foik, C.S.C.[2] That same year, the College of St. Catherine, a girls' school in St. Paul, Minnesota, offered a course for school librarians, which included elementary reference work, classification, cataloguing, and library management. Not until 1929, eleven years later, was the St. Catherine Library School organized with a one year programme leading to the degree of B. Ed. for Librarianship.[3] It was accredited by the A. L. A. Board in 1931. Rosary College, River Forest, Illinois, and St. Francis College, Brooklyn, New York, both began to conduct classes in library methods in 1922. Ten years later, in 1932, Rosary College enlarged its course from the six semester hours of library work it had offered to thirty semester hours, or one full year of work as "credits" are measured. In 1938 it was accredited by the A. L. A. Board of Education for Librarianship.

The Catholic University, Washington, and Loyola University, Chicago, began library courses in 1929; St. Bonaventure College, St. Bonaventure, New York, and Niagara University, Niagara Falls, New York, in 1930. Nazareth College, Louisville,

---

[1] One indication of the preponderance of women in library work may be found in an analysis of attendance records in the *Proceedings* of the American Library Association Conferences, which shows the following figures for librarians of all sorts:

Year	1922	1928	1933	1937
Men	180	151	255	524
Women	1381	811	2200	3953

[2] Father Foik, now a veteran librarian, began learning library methods in the library of his own community house of studies. He got his degree of Ph.D in the School of Philosophy, Catholic University of America, in 1913, with a dissertation on "Pioneer Efforts of Catholic Journalism in the United States," which he later developed into the book, *Pioneer Catholic Journalism*, U. S. Catholic Historical Society Monographs, XI, New York, 1930.

[3] From correspondence with Director of school, through the kindness of Eva M. Perry.

opened a department of library science in 1929, and Our Lady of the Lake College, San Antonio, Texas, in 1931. The year following, Mundelein College, Chicago, St. Mary's College, Notre Dame, Indiana, and St. Mary-of-the-Woods College, began offering thirty semester hour courses.[1] Courses in library methods are offered at Sacred Heart Junior College, Louisville; Marylhurst College, Oswego, Oregon; St. Xaxier College, Chicago; and Clarke College, Dubuque, Iowa.[2] In 1935, Georgian Court College, Lakewood, New Jersey, St. Michael's Diocesan High School, Brooklyn, New York, Marywood College, Scranton, Pennsylvania, Mount Mary College, Milwaukee, Wisconsin, and DePaul University, Chicago, reported that "courses in library science are offered as part of the regular curriculum."[3] The student enrollment in these courses offered by Catholic schools is probably more than ninety per cent female.

A certain wavering and shifting in some of the Catholic colleges offering courses in library methods may reflect the uncertainty in student demand for such courses, as it assuredly does reflect a vague insecurity on the part of the colleges themselves, in the face of pressure, direct or indirect, by the "standardizing agencies." A few of the simple beginnings of Catholic library instruction sought the protection of accreditation by the A. L. A.; and two have so far secured it. But others thought that that game was not worth the candle, and allowed what might have developed into useful means of instruction to wither away. One director of library science courses in a Catholic college, after six years of experiment, discontinued the courses because he felt that he should not sell his school down the river for the dubious approval of a "standardizing agency."

Formal library training in the Catholic schools is organized in these three ways: in library schools, offering a year's work; in library science departments, offering from six to twenty semester hours of work; and in summer courses, usually of six semester hours. Exact statistics are not available. But on a rough estimate, one may say that at present about one in fifteen of the Catholic colleges offer one or more of these three types of instruction in library work; that they enroll, all told, between 350 and 400 students in library courses; but that only about one-fifth of these schools confer any special degree in library science. The organization of courses and methods of instruction are, in most instances, copied from those of the non-Catholic library schools. A majority of the teachers in Catholic library schools have received their instruction in library methods at non-Catholic institutions.

---

[1] These facts and dates are drawn from information gathered, in 1932, by Eva M. Perry, through correspondence with the schools mentioned.

[2] These are from the *Directory of Catholic Colleges and Schools, 1932.* Published by N. C. W. C. Department of Education.

[3] *Catholic Library World,* 6:81. (June, 1935.)

6. Some Problems in Training Catholic Librarians

The situation in the United States as regards education for librarianship presents a good many problems for the Catholic libraries and librarians. In this book we cannot discuss them all, and it is not likely that we can solve any of them. The aim of this section must be, as it has been of so much else in the book, to set before the reader, at least in brief outline, what some few of the problems are.

A. The Problem of Extent of Librarian Training

Whether or not Catholic librarians are to go in for formal training in library work is no longer an open question. Some of them began to do so twenty years ago; and each year is adding to their number. But there is still a very large and important question as to how extensive that formal training should be. Should it consist of a few simple courses in the fundamental techniques of library work, such as classification, cataloguing, and the use of bibliographic tools? Should it go on to include modern technical substitutes for scholarship, such as the courses that pretend to equip the students to select books for a library, or to equip them with the knowledge needed for scholarly reference work, not through the slow and patient digging away of the scholar through long years, but through rapid-fire acquaintance with compilations of what some one else thinks of current books? Should Catholic librarians be trained in the techniques of direct reader services drawn from the practices of public libraries? Should Catholic libraries accept the blunt fact that library schools are vocational schools, and confine the work they offer to practical *training,* or should they ambition to include both training and education in the bewildered way now so common in all sorts of technical schools?

Common sense demands that some answer to questions like these must be given, in order to determine the character of the work to be offered in training Catholic librarians. In practice, beyond a doubt, some of the answers to these questions will be made upon the basis of sheer imitation of what is done in other library schools, a straight policy of "keeping up with the Joneses," without much intelligent consideration of whys and wherefores. Some answers may be made under compulsion, if only the indirect compulsion of seeking the approval of the A. L. A. Board. The time may also come, perhaps in not so distant a future, when the compulsion of governmental certification of librarians will be added to the social compulsion of approval by "standardization agencies."[1] Is it possible that some answers may be made upon a definite understanding of the needs of Catholic librarians, and upon a study of the objectives in library training that suit those needs?

---

[1] So far, the sustained efforts of the American Library Association and of the various state library associations to secure the enactment of librarian certification laws appear to have been aimed only at librarians in public libraries and in school college libraries supported by public funds. In that respet, their action partakes of the protective character of a trade union's campaign, or of a lobby for the extension of civil service laws. Whether or not, and when, it will reach out to include private school librarians, we do not know. In 1938, eleven states enforced certification of librarians in the public libraries; twenty-six states and the District of Columbia had laws for certifying school librarians; in California, Colorado, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Missouri, and Oregon, the state library associations failed to secure passage of the laws, "in spite of active campaigns"; in Ohio, the governor vetoed the certification law, after unanimous passage by both houses; in Nebraska, the bill was defeated in the legislature. "The Board of Education for Librarianship continued to encourage legal certification." (*Bulletin of the A. L. A.*, 32:548-549. Sept., 1938.) The American Library Association has been considering National Certification since 1916. One of its Committees submitted plans in 1919 and 1921. Those and several other plans have hung fire. But there is at present a standing Committee on Federal Relations, some account of whose lobbying work, particularly as regards the Harrison-Thomas-Fletcher Bill, may be read in *Bulletin A. L. A.*, 32:634-635.

The problem of the extent of training for Catholic librarians is not wholly in the hands of the librarians themselves. It is a part of the much larger problem that concerns the training of all faculty members of Catholic colleges and schools: a problem that is causing much worry to Catholic educational administrators, and that at present is being solved in a variety of ways, with no certain indications of a definite policy based upon Catholic principles and the traditions and special character of Catholic schools.

The uncertainty in this regard is, in turn, part of the general bewilderment consequent upon the fact that all American education, Catholic included, is in a stage of transition. Catholic librarians, like all others engaged in the Catholic work of education, can only hope and pray that our Catholic schools and libraries may come through this unhappy period of uncertainty with our cultural heritage undamaged and our distinctive purposes sustained.

But as one minor contribution to the solution of this particular problem of the training of Catholic librarians, it is here suggested that Catholic training schools consider realistically how extensive a librarian training is possible and desirable, and that they remember in a practical way the kind of material they have to train, and the circumstances in which their future graduates are to work. So remembering, they may be able to wrench their gaze away from grandiose schemes of equipping chief librarians of large libraries, and look clearly at the mediocre talent asking for a modest training to be used in a small school or college library.

The man or woman, always a rare person, who has the genuine ability requisite for great librarianship, is not in such need of formal training as the little fellow who is helpless before even a little job in a little library. In fact, the whole history of formal training for library work makes evident that it is in the needs of the minor librarians that the movement for training schools and classes has found its strongest argument.

B. The Problem of Library Degrees

There is another problem coming into the training of Catholic librarians and already beginning to be a serious problem. It is a problem that previously existed elsewhere, and has been borrowed by the poor librarians from the whole system of modern education in the United States. It may be expressed in this question: What are we to do about the snobbery of degrees?

An academic degree, in the United States, is an outward label indicating that its holder has accumulated a certain amount of "credits" in a school. No small part of the American people have come to reverence more the label than any possible educational achievement it may stand for. The educational development without the label is valueless in their eyes; granted the label, they do not dream of questioning the education. It was, I believe, Albert Jay Nock who suggested that each American boy and girl be given a college degree with his or her birth certificate; with that out of the way, they might begin their education unhampered.

There is something naive and childish, characteristic of a shallow civilization, in this worshipping of degrees. It is quite akin to the love of artificial distinction which makes of so many men and women "joiners," which multiplies badges and insignia that signify neither achievement nor exalted function. The lure of such insignia goes with a primitive culture, not with high intelligence or scholarship or mastery of the arts. Until a score of years ago, for instance, the members of one of the great religious orders ordinarily did not receive or display academic degrees in recognition of their school education; yet their education was demonstrably as sound and thorough through some centuries preceding as in the recent years when nervous eagerness for degrees marks most of the young members of the order. The current fashion of hungering for degrees has something of the look of atavism; it almost smacks of woad painting and tatooing.

In the *Proceedings* of the Catholic Library Association Conference of 1938 (the terminology is a hasty borrowing from the A. L. A.), the record of attendance is analyzed, for the first time, on the basis of those who were, or were not, "graduates of accredited library schools," and a distinction was made between holders of a first and of a second degree. Of the 4,000 or more Catholic librarians in the United States, 107 attended the C. L. A. Conference. They were divided into 52 sheep with degrees and 55 goats without degrees. Of the Catholic Sisters attending, only about one-fourth had library degrees; of the priests, a little more than one-third; of the secular librarians, nearly three-fourths, representing 54% of the total of those in attendance who had degrees from "accredited" library schools.

For the layman, librarianship is ordinarily a means of livelihood; and a degree stands practically in the place of a trade recommendation or a truck-driver's license or a union card. As such, it is an excellent thing; but it is not quite the whole of librarianship. The man with a library degree may or may not be an educated man; he may or may not be, in addition, a scholar; he may or may not have aptitude for library work, or experience in library work. But all these possibilities are irrelevant beside the current questions: has he a library degree? did he get it in an "accredited" school? The pressure upon priests and Sisters in Catholic libraries is slightly less, because, although it is still backed by a puerile snobbery, it lacks the economic force that affects the layman.

Since, at the time of the C. L. A. Conference, there was only one "accredited" Catholic library school, and that one a girls' school and closely restricted in its enrollment, the plumping of the C. L. A. officials for degrees from "accredited" schools meant an impulse to Catholic librarians to attend non-Catholic library schools. It meant, also, amongst other things, that Father Foik, for instance, who inaugurated the first library classes in a Catholic college, should now be disbarred from such teaching because he has no degree from an "accredited" library school.

C. The Problem of Maintaining Catholic Traditions

All this leads to a consideration of what is, undoubtedly, the central problem of training Catholic librarians. How is their training to respect and foster the Catholic culture of our librarians as contrasted with the non-Catholic culture that surrounds us? It is, of course, quite true that the techniques of using bibliographic tools are in themselves neutral, as neutral as the plumber's technique of "wiping a joint" or the old western teamster's technique of "mule-skinning." But it is also true that these neutral library techniques can be informed by a Christian or a pagan spirit. The techniques of book selection hinge upon the use of "aids in book selection"; and the authoritative aids studied in non-Catholic library schools largely ignore, not only Catholic books, but Catholic standards of value in books and Catholic principles regarding book selection.

At the 1938 C. L. A. Conference, one of the papers read excoriated the standard "book list," no doubt with much applause from the Catholic librarians who heard the paper.[1] But there is no sense in the C. L. A.'s condemning such aids in book selection, when at the same time it more than approves of Catholic librarians' securing their library training in schools where these "book lists" are stressed as a main source of guidance in book selection. Much the same may be said of the emphasis which non-Catholic library schools put upon certain types of direct reader service that clash with the needs, the aims, and the traditions of Catholic school libraries. The development of library techniques in the public libraries has naturally had a vital influence upon the teaching in non-Catholic library schools, and has led them to advocate a philosophy of education which is alien, and often quite contradictory, to the Catholic view of education.

An abundance of unpleasant experience has proven clearly that few Catholics can be exposed, day in, day out, to a hostile temper and atmosphere in non-Catholic library schools without having their judgment unwittingly warped away from the Catholic culture which they may have acquired before entering such schools. It is not taking on a "holier-than-thou" attitude to insist that our Catholic cultural inheritance is immensely more valuable, for time and eternity, than the vacillating emotional enthusiasm for some naturalistic utopian ideals of library work which the Catholic student inevitably catches in non-Catholic schools.

If it be suggested, as a solution of this problem of securing a Catholic training for Catholic librarians, that we must build up our own Catholic library schools, precisely as we have built up other schools of our own, that is a sound and wholesome suggestion. But to be effective, it must take into account several facts. One fact is that, so long as regimentation of Catholic library schools is in the hands of agencies that little know, and less respect, our Catholic point of view, the Catholic library schools cannot but be held back from the full realization of the Catholic tradition. Another fact is that it is psychologically impossible for teachers in a Catholic library school who have derived their instruction and inspiration from non-Catholic schools not to carry over a great deal of the non-Catholic approach to library work and to act in the Catholic schools as propagandists of ideas opposed to the Catholic culture. *Fas est et ab hoste doceri,* and "spoiling the Egyptians," are phrases as true and as appealing today as in the fourth century; but they demand now, as then, the wisdom to keep on remembering that the Egyptians *are* Egyptians.

---

[1] See excerpts from the paper read by Eugene Willging, in *The Catholic Library World,* 10:35-36. (October, 1938.)

There is a special danger with regard to Catholic library schools in the impatience with which some Catholic librarians view the slow and cautious development of Catholic libraries and library schools. A rather proud and intolerant impatience, very fretful of criticism from non-Catholic librarians, insists irritably, not merely that Catholic library schools must use what is sound in modern library practice, but that they must use it *right away,* and with no patient discrimination to judge carefully what is sound and what is not sound in that practice. If we are intelligent, we do not want to "spoil the Egyptians" of their ten plagues along with their skill in letters and administration.

Allied with that impatience is a temper mentioned before in this book, something like what the modern jargon calls "an inferiority complex," which urges some Catholic librarians to despise much of their cultural inheritance, and to praise without stint every non-Catholic movement in library work. It is no mark of wisdom for Catholics to join eagerly in the cry, "Can anything good come out of Nazareth?" Something, in fact, quite a lot of things, very good did come from the long tradition of Catholic scholarship upon which our modern libraries and the best in our modern civilizations have been built. That inheritance, in library work as in other fields of human endeavor, is likely to stand when the frothy movements of a pagan day have spent themselves.

D. The Problem of Control of Catholic Library Schools

The very small number of Catholic librarians who advocate that Catholic colleges offering instruction in library methods be regulated by the indefinite standards of the American Library Association argue that we must have some safeguards for the quality of teaching done in Catholic library classes. That is, of course, the foundation of all schemes of school regimentation: distrust of the individual schools, a presumption that without external compulsion the schools will slack up in administration, in equipment, and in teaching methods. It is also an assumption that the standardizers, without a divine promise of infallibility, are somehow beyond criticism in their own practices and capable of furnishing sound guidance to others. Every such scheme of regimentation ignores the very pertinent question: Who shall standardize the standardizers? It is impossible, in this small book, to thresh out so large a question as that.

But even granting, for the sake of argument, that there is need of some external policing to keep up the quality of work in Catholic library schools, it is not immediately obvious who should exercise control over the schools. To surrender authority over Catholic library schools to any organization out of sympathy with Catholic aims, not informed about Catholic conditions, would appear to be suicidal. It certainly would invite the destruction of whatever of the Catholic tradition still remains in those schools.

Recently, a vague rumor seems to be creeping about that the Vatican Library might take over the function of regimenting the Catholic library schools in the United States. Some may have seen a hint of that in Mr. Hanson's interview in 1928, as reported by Mr. Koch.[1] Is it not possible, now that the Vatican Library has received, so to say, the blessing of the A. L. A., has adopted the L. C. Classification, and has begun a library school of its own, headed by Signor Igino Giordani, who studied for some months in American library schools, that the Vatican Library may set the standards for Catholic libraries and Catholic library schools in the United States? Signor Giordani, in conversation, has disclaimed any such ambition; has said that the idea is not of his begetting.

---

[1] See *Supra,* p. 97.

In reality, the disclaimer is rather superfluous. Despite the sentimental hopes of a few Catholic librarians, and the ambitions of a few others, such a control of Catholic librarian training is not a practical possibility. No well-informed Catholic dreams that the Vatican Library, admired and revered as it is by all Catholic librarians, is part of the apparatus of the infallible teaching Church. It has been, in its own history, well administered, and ill administered. It is a great library, no more, no less; it has associations that make it venerable; it has great treasures of valuable historical materials; it has a long tradition of the scholarship currently so little accounted in American library practice; but it is not the official mentor, much less the "standardizing agency," of other Catholic libraries.

If there must be regimentation of the Catholic library schools, the proper "standardizing agency" would seem to be the National Catholic Educational Association. The N. C. E. A. is the representative organization of Catholic schools and colleges; and nearly all the Catholic libraries in the United States are school or college libraries. It would seem most natural that the tail should go with the dog.

Catholic librarians have freely criticized the conduct of the N. C. E. A. as it affected their work. Some of that criticism may be little more than plain bumptiousness, resentment on the part of the critics that they are in an inevitable position of dependence upon the policy of the schools in whose libraries they work; some of it may be justified by the not entirely enviable uncertainty that the N. C. E. A. has displayed in maintaining the Catholic tradition in education. But if there is poor liaison between the Catholic librarians and the N. C. E. A., that is a situation that can be remedied by earnest efforts.

In any case, the Catholic librarians and library schools cannot escape the fact that their lot is bound up with that of the Catholic colleges, and that whatever policy may be adopted by the N. C. E. A. necessarily affects their schools as constituent members of the N. C. E. A. In the next chapter something must be said about the relations between the Catholic Library Association and the N. C. E. A. But whatever those relations may be, it is impossible to see how the Catholic library schools can dissociate themselves from the standards and policies set up by the one national organization representing the Catholic colleges of the United States.

E. The Problem of the Teacher Librarians

Although the question of the training of Catholic teacher librarians has already been noticed in passing, its importance merits a brief special consideration. The problem with regard to the teacher librarians arises from two opposing facts: the fact that those who assume to guide Catholic librarians in their formal school preparation for library work are so largely taken up with the view of library work in large libraries, having full staff organizations; and the contrasting fact that most of the Catholic librarians not merely work in very small libraries, as a one-man staff, but must do their library work as a part-time job, as a task added to their teaching work. The problem may be stated thus: What amount of training do these part-time teacher librarians need? What kind of training do they need? How are they to secure that training?

But first we must consider how numerous these Catholic teacher librarians are, how large a proportion they form of all the Catholic librarians. There are no exact data upon which to base calculation of their numbers. As has already been noted, the statistics gathered by the U. S. Office of Education in 1929 are faulty both through omission and through padding.[1] Not merely did many Catholic libraries fail to turn in a report (those that failed to do so included a few of the larger libraries and a great many of the smaller libraries), but some of those that did report apparently failed to understand the request for the number of librarians exclusive of student assistants. Hence the total of 736 librarians claimed for the 412 Catholic libraries that made a report to the U. S. Office of Education in 1929 is not accurate, and is probably exaggerated.

In some instances, the exaggeration is known through direct information to the present writer. Here are a few such instances, with the names of the libraries suppressed, based on the 1929 report:

---

[1] See *Supra*, p. 30.

Library	No. of vols.	Librarians reported	Actual No. of Librarians
1	10,488	10	1 plus student assistants
2	14,000	17	2 plus student assistants
3	10,600	5	2 plus student assistants
4	10,000	15	2 plus student assistants
5	10,000	6	1 plus student assistants
6	35,000	5	2 plus student assistants
7	29,800	9	2 plus student assistants
8	17,500	10	2 plus student assistants
9	3,000	5	1 plus student assistants

In only two of these libraries was there a full-time librarian.

If we approach an estimate from the side of what we know regarding the size of Catholic libraries, the frequent dearth of personnel in many Catholic school staffs, and observation of many typical Catholic school libraries, we may, perhaps, reach as good an approximation as is possible of the number of teacher librarians in Catholic libraries. We may start with these figures, regarding size of Catholic libraries, drawn from the U. S. Office of Education *Statistics for 1929*:

412 libraries reported having 3,000 or more volumes
122 of the 412 reported having 10,000 or more volumes
45 of the 122 reported having 25,000 or more volumes
6 of the 45 reported having 100,000 or more volumes

These figures can be supplemented for 1938 from information derived through direct correspondence with some Catholic librarians, as follows:

1 library	300,000 volumes	11 full-time librarians
1 library	200,000 volumes	4 full-time librarians
8 libraries	100,000-199,999	69 full-time librarians
6 libraries	50,000- 99,999	21 full-time librarians
13 libraries	25,000- 49,000	28 full-time librarians

From these figures it is reasonable to conclude that the larger Catholic libraries are matching their growth in size with an increase in the number of their librarians. But we are still left to conjecture for the growth in size, and in number of librarians, of the smaller libraries.

It is a safe conjecture that even the smaller Catholic libraries have been steadily growing in number of volumes since 1929. It may not be too wild a guess that there are now more than 700 of the 3,000 Catholic libraries that can claim 3,000 or more volumes each. If we gratuitously stretch that figure to 1,000, and allow each of those libraries to have at least one full-time librarian, we shall probably be making a very liberal estimate. In spite of the common knowledge of how short-handed many of the Catholic high schools are in faculty members, suppose we add another 500 full-time librarians, to include the larger high schools, the colleges, and the universities; if we make that conjecture, we are still not likely to err on the side of niggardliness. But even all these generous estimates would still leave 2,500 of the 4,000 or more Catholic librarians, rather more than 62%, as part-time teacher librarians.

It is, again, a reasonable conjecture that most of those 2,500 Catholic teacher librarians are in charge of libraries ranging in size from less than 1,000 to not more than 5,000 volumes; and that neither their schools nor their school libraries are likely ever to become very large. For such librarians, a rather simple formal training, as limited as that which used to be given in the training classes conducted by some of the public libraries, might possibly be adequate as a foundation for their own continued development, through study and practice, of the library skills needed in their small libraries. With that limited amount of formal training, they would at least be as well off, for a start in library work, as Panizzi, Jewett, Dewey, Poole, Ehrle, Edwards,[1] Garvy, and Foik. It has been proven by experience that such a training can be given to reasonably apt students in six semester hours of class and laboratory work.

How are these Catholic teacher librarians to secure even this limited amount of technical training in library work? It is sheer nonsense to suggest that they attend a regular library school.

---

[1] James Farnham Edwards (1850-1911) was born at Toledo, Ohio, became a student at Notre Dame at the tender age of ten, and continued there the rest of his life. He was appointed librarian in 1874, took his LL.B. in 1875, and M.A. in 1882. He did much to build up the library of the University, and its superb archival collection.

These are working people, who cannot take time off from their work during the school year. They are, moreover, poor people, often of a poverty that would shock their critics; most of them are vowed to poverty, and are members of poor communities unable to spend much money on the library training of their teacher librarians. The two sources of formal instruction in library work practically open to them are the two most heartily despised by those "professional" librarians, Catholic and non-Catholic, who envisage utopias of elaborate and severely regimented education for librarianship: summer school courses, and correspondence school courses.

If, through the restrictions of the "standardizing agencies," these two sources are closed to the Catholic teacher librarians, the result will not be to send the teacher librarians to full-fledged library schools; they will still have neither the time nor the money to go to library schools. The result will be to make certain that these teacher librarians get no library training at all, beyond what they can pick up by their own observation, study, and practice. Whether or not such a result would be a blessing to Catholic libraries and librarians, is a question not so easy to answer; it is, perhaps, a question open to endless debate. In any case, no one can afford to forget that, with or without library schools, education for librarianship, like all other education, forever remains self-education; and that library schools, like all other schools, at their best are only one of the many aids that men may use in educating themselves.

CHAPTER IX

PROBLEMS OF LIBRARY ASSOCIATIONS

Man is, by his very nature, a social being. He is born into that first of all societies, a family. He grows into the society of a neighborhood, a village, town, or city, a state. If he is a Christian, he is a member of the society established by Jesus Christ, the Church. He has need of these various societies for his maintenance, his development, the full realization of his capacities, natural and supernatural. But, even beyond his absolute needs, man is actively social because he finds comfort, companionship, intellectual and emotional satisfaction, in voluntarily associating with his fellowmen into groups.

As civilization becomes more complex, these groups tend to multiply both in their numbers and in their purposes. It would probably be impossible to reckon up the full number and variety of groups or associations which men have formed in the past and which they maintain today. These groups shift and change a great deal. They go through cycles of growth and decay, and new groups take the place of old ones. The restlessness of the human spirit is reflected in the changing pattern of social organizations. Forever, new hopes, new ambitions, new responses to the actions of other groups, new schemes of defence of established traditions, or new plans to break up traditions, new mass movements in fashion, or industry, or amusement, or religion, or education, or political aspiration, sway the minds of men to new associations, all inspired, although men may not realize it, by our indomitable hunger for our lost paradise.

1. AMERICAN ZEAL FOR "ASSOCIATIONS"

When the people of the United States were a pioneer people, living close to the soil, scattered in small settlements, making great lonesome ventures into an undeveloped land, their social organizations were kept to the bare minimum dictated by necessity. "Rugged individualism" was the mark of the pioneers, of men who had cut away from an old cultural environment and were hacking a brave new world of their own out of forests and plains. But as the frontiers merged into the seaboard cultures, and the roots of the old world stretched farther out into the new, social relations began again to be complex, and social organizations began to multiply, to mature and decay, and give way to new associations; the social cycle started again upon its age-old round.

Almost from the first, most of our people belonged to political associations, just as most of them did *not* belong to any church or religious association. By the time we had become a nation, Protestantism had thinned out in doctrine and in organization; and Catholicism, repressed in the colonies, had not yet begun to recruit itself by immigration. But below the level of these great regional, state, national, and supra-national associations, the American people began to form a great variety of groups. Their origins, naturally, were in the cities, since social organizations thrive only where men are physically near one another. Some of the associations were in defence of individual rights, such as the various trade unions, medical associations, legal associations; some were cultural in their aims.

It is worthy of note that the cultural associations came first: such as John Adams' "American Academy of Arts and Sciences," in Boston, 1780; the New York "American Academy of Arts," 1808; "The National Academy of Design," in 1826. But the associations in defence of the rights of labor followed immediately upon their heels: the "Cordwainers' Union," of Philadelphia, as early as 1789; a group of unions in "The Mechanics' Trades' Union," the first nationwide association, was formed at New York, in 1834. The medical and legal professions organized quite early in local associations; but "The American Medical Association" came into existence only in 1847, a year before the foundation of "The American Association for the Advancement of Science"; and "The American Bar Association" was founded only in 1878. The historians were still later in organizing; 1884 saw the beginnings of both "The American Historical Association" at Saratoga, New York, and "The American Catholic Historical Association," at Philadelphia.

But these were only like the first few swarms of the locusts; back of them were a host of other associations: some fraternal and "mutual benevolent," some semi-political, some purely recreational, some for the indulgence of intellectual or social snobbery; associations to suit every need, taste, or whim, or sometimes the greed or ambition of their organizers: Chautauquans, Druids, Elks, The Efficiency Society, the Greek Letter Fraternities and Sororities, The Independent Order of Red Men, The Clan-na-Gael, The Tribe of Ben Hur, The Daughters of the American Revolution, the Ku Klux Klan, various Educational Associations, The Sons of Temperance, The Military Order of the Carabao, and perhaps a thousand more.[1] Before the close of the nineteenth century, the American people had become a most astonishing nation of "joiners." It is not too much to say that the ubiquity of minor and wildly overlapping group organizations as distinctively marked the later American civilization as "rugged individualism" had marked the days of the pioneers. The people who had gone out alone to the forests and the plains rushed back into minutely organized life with something akin to violence.

Now it must be noted that group organizations, which we primarily think of as *uniting* people, also serve powerfully to *divide* them. Each organized group, because it has its own separate existence, its own aims and projects, its own great or small authority, its own executive machinery and means of action, sets up barriers between its members and those who are not its members. The barriers are invisible; they may be weak or strong; they may be backed by oaths of secrecy, or may get their chief strength only from snobbery; but of whatever kind they are, they ring their members round as an enclosed group, a social entity separated from other men.

Sometimes the dividing force of group organizations has led to conflict between the group and other groups, or even, as in the case of the "Mafia," between the group and the rest of society. Thus, "The National Labor Union," founded in 1866, was only three years in existence when it clashed vigorously with

---

[1] *The World Almanac*, 1938, without claiming that its list is exhaustive, enumerates over 600 American associations. (Pp. 396-47.) For brief accounts of a large number of them, see the various encyclopedias, especially *The Encyclopedia Americana*.

"The Knights of Labor," in a quarrel that included craft unions *versus* non-craft unions, a good deal like the current conflict betweeen the A. F. L. and the C. I. O. The first Ku Klux Klan was organized for a definite conflict, for opposition to the Federal policy of Reconstruction. The second Ku Klux Klan set up barriers of racial and religious hatred between its members and Catholics, Jews, and Negroes. How much element of conflict may be latent in any group organization depends upon its character, aims, and methods.

But it must be said of the vast number of associations fostered in the United States that most of them, although variously separatist in their nature, do not wilfully create contentions; that many of them are so vague in purpose and so ineffective in organization that, even with all the bad will in the world, they could not set up any barriers save the flimsiest; and that many others are so little mutually exclusive that there is nothing incongruous or embarrassing in one person belonging to a dozen or a score of them. In fact, the very zeal of the American people as "joiners" tends to soften the disparities between organized groups, and to make their barriers very flexible. We are, on the whole, a singularly friendly people, less inclined than many another to be stiff or socially self-conscious in our dealings with one another; and our geniality makes it easy for us to ignore to a considerable extent the artificial barriers set up by our multitudinous associations.

2. The Beginnings of Library Associations

In a nation so friendly, and so fond of banding together into groups, it might seem strange that those excellent people, the librarians, should not have been amongst the earliest to unite in local, regional, and ultimately national, associations. American librarians are by now so familiar with their large number of library associations that it may be difficult for them to conceive of a time when there were no library associations. Yet group organization of librarians is a very new thing, one of the social phenomena of the latter half of the nineteenth century, and apparently quite unknown through all the previous centuries. Some knowledge of its beginnings is important to any clear understanding of its later developments.

A. The Predecessors of Library Associations

In the long history of libraries we do not find that the librarians seem ever to have been organized into a separate group. They were not unsocial creatures; they visited one another's libraries in the course of their bibliographic work; they corresponded with one another by letter; they had the fellowship of scholars, with interest in the work that other scholars were doing, an interest that was sometmies kindly, sometimes critical, sometimes envious. Now and then librarians were members of learned societies; but they were members because they were scholars, not because they were librarians. When they met with other librarians, no doubt they talked about books; but it is not likely that they talked much about classification or cataloguing or direct reader service. They had all these library practices; but they looked upon them as the affairs of each library alone. They had no problem of uniformity in, say, classification or cataloguing or circulation records, because such problems were not considered intrinsic to good library work, and in fact were created, quite artificially, after the librarians had begun to organize into groups. In a word, organization had no place in the long tradition of librarianship, because, until a great change came into the work of librarians, there was no apparent need to gather librarians into a separate group.

But the librarians are only one section of the middlemen who function between the author and his readers. The other section is made up of publishers and booksellers. The interest of publishers and booksellers in the spread of books, although in many ways akin to that of modern librarians, is not exactly the same as theirs at all points. Some of the publishers and booksellers have been, it is true, as scholarly men and as devoted to the intrinsic worth of books as any librarian; yet the major concern of publishers and booksellers is necessarily more commercial than that of librarians, although the latter too have a necessary trade interest in the spread of books, since their positions and their salaries, especially in very recent times, are bound up with their success in promoting the circulation of books.[1]

Most naturally, therefore, the men of books who did organize, and that quite early, were the publishers and booksellers. It is possible that there was a publishers' association at Alexandria when it was the great center of the book trade. Birt deduces the existence of one at Rome in the beginning of the second century.[2] It is not likely that any publishers' association continued through the Dark Ages, or in the early Middle Ages, when the making and copying of books was almost exclusively in the hands of the monks. But with the rise of the universities, the booksellers were recognized as a definite "profession" regulated by laws, and with stiff entrance examinations.[3] Mumby traces the forerunners of the English Stationers' Company back to 1357, and their successful application for a charter of association to 1404, an event celebrated five hundred years later by the Stationers' Company,[4] which was itself chartered in 1557.

There is no need to labor the point that publishers and booksellers kept up various associations throughout later European history. The first definite association in the United States seems to have been "The American Company of Booksellers," organized at New York in 1802, under the leadership of Matthew Carey, one of the early Catholic publishers, and in imitation of the British Stationers' Company. It was successful for a few years in securing co-operation amongst publishers; but it was wrecked by unscrupulous competition.[5] We shall see that when, fifty years later, the librarians first met, with the purpose of forming an association, it was a bookseller and publisher of New York who took the lead in calling them together.

---

[1] One publisher, still living, who deserves special mention for his genuine devotion to bibliography, often at a pecuniary loss to himself, is Mr. Halsey William Wilson, the head of the New York firm that has published so many excellent bibliographic tools for the use of libraries. For a brief account of Mr. Wilson and his work, see *The New Yorker*, 29 October, 1938, pp. 25-28.

[2] G. H. Putnam, *Authors and their Public in Ancient Times*, New York, 1894, p. 242.

[3] G. H. Putnam, *Books and their Makers during the Middle Ages*, 2 vols., New York, 1897; I, 206 sqq. for the account of *libraires* and *écrivains* at Paris in 1368.

[4] F. A. Mumby, *Publishing and Bookselling*, New York, 1931, pp. 40-41. For the incorporation of the Stationers' Company, see p. 65.

[5] H. W. Boynton, *Annals of American Bookselling*, New York, 1932, p. 137.

B. The Groundwork of Early Association of Librarians

One can scarcely help asking the question: Why was it that, four hundred years after the European invention of printing, and in a country not yet conspicuous for its great libraries, the movement for organizing librarians into separate groups should first begin to take form, and should thereafter have developed with such astonishing vigor? To miss the answer to that question is to run a great risk of not understanding the whole of the modern library movement in the United States.

Plenty of non-Catholic writers are quite willing to trace the answer to the religious revolt of the sixteenth century, to what they call the freeing of the human mind from the shackles of ecclesiastical authority, and to the substitution of a Book, the Bible, for the traditional teaching of the Church. Whether or not one cares to go quite so far into the past as that, this sequence of events is historically established: that Protestantism broke down, through lack of doctrinal and disciplinary authority, into sporadic sectarian divisions; that after the break-up came a violent revulsion to naturalism; that the growth of naturalism inspired those exaggerated hopes of what man could do, without God, for his own advancement through education, hopes of which Rousseau was only one of a chorus of prophets; that education came to be, in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, more and more an affair of schools and books; that the uncertain notions of "democracy" stemming out of the French Revolution blended in with the dreams of naturalists, and made universal schooling and the universal spread of reading one of the bulwarks of "democracy"; that some of the earnest advocates of these substitutes for Christianity as the most powerful civilizers of mankind looked upon the spread of books and libraries with a zeal that was almost religious; that the publishers and booksellers not unnaturally welcomed this new dispensation of "salvation by books"; and that all these forces, naturalistic theology, glorification of the schools, of reading, and of libraries, the pious hopes of post-Christian educators and librarians, and the commercial keeness of publishers, all joined together to create amongst librarians something of a crusading spirit, most attractive to Americans, an energetic people as filled with naturalistic enthusiasms as they were empty of Christian beliefs, a people who invented more "isms" in the nineteenth century than all the rest of the world together.[1]

That is a long sentence; but it does no more than roughly outline what would need a whole book or series of books to present properly. The doctrinaire naturalism of Europe became a flaming creed in the United States. The library movement was only a part of it; but it was not an insignificant part. That impulse of naturalistic hope was back of the many efforts, notable in England as well as in the United States, to get governmental support for the diffusion and maintenance of libraries. It is the hopes inspired by naturalism that explain the glorying and rejoicing in each legal enactment that promoted libraries, dating back to the English Parliamentary "Act for the Preservation of Parochial Libraries,"[2] the passing of which was procured in 1709 by Dr. Thomas Bray, the founder of the "Society for the Propagation of the Gospel." The first free town library in the English colonies in America was founded at New York, in 1700, by bequest of the Reverend John Sharp, and was added to, about 1730, by a gift from the "Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Lands."[3]

The State of New Hampshire led the way in government support of public libraries; Pennsylvania, Ohio, and New York legally established state libraries between 1813 and 1818; and New York State passed its law for the maintenance of "District Libraries" in 1838; enriching those libraries with nearly a million and a half books in the first ten years, and by nearly four million volumes in the next twenty years.[4] Before the close of the century most of the States had passed laws appropriating money for the maintenance of state, county, district, or municipal public libraries.

---

[1] For an inadequate, but lively, account of a few of the American cults, see Gilbert Seldes, *The Stammering Century*, New York, 1928.

[2] Edward Edwards, *Free Town Libraries*, London, 1869, p. 9.

[3] *Ibid.*, pp. 271-272.

[4] *Ibid.*, pp. 276-279. A. E. Bostwick, *The American Public Library*, New York, 1910, p. 8. *Special Report* of the U. S. Bureau of Education, 1876, *Public Libraries in the U. S. A.*, pp. 389-402; 445-464.

But the enthusiasm for libraries, "the peoples' universities," did not wait upon government money alone. Nor was it confined to those who had rejected all religious affiliations and explicitly adopted the theory of naturalism. Sincere Protestants, Jews, and Catholics were caught up in that excited turning to books and libraries by a nation coming out of the backwoods and eager for the richer culture associated with books. Both the Young Men's Christian Association, founded at Boston in 1851, and the various Catholic Young Men's Associations, from their very origins joined themselves with the library movement.[1] Athenaeums, Lyceums, and other subscription libraries abounded. Enthusiasm for libraries was in the air, was shared by men and women who had not the slightest idea of its source, who earnestly desired "the refining influence" of books for themselves, and many of whom were almost ready to force that influence upon others in the spirit of the Western command, "Smile, damn you, smile!" Rich men began to donate public libraries, after the example of the Astor library in New York.[2] America was beginning to be "library-minded."

C. The First Convention of Librarians

On September 15, 1853, Charles B. Norton, a publisher and bookseller of New York, with his partner, S. Hastings Grant, and three librarians, Reuben A. Guild of Brown University, Daniel C. Gilman of Yale, and Charles C. Jewett of the Smithsonian Institution, assembled a group of eighty-two men, from twelve states and the District of Columbia, publishers, booksellers, and librarians, to consider how they might "provide for the diffusion of a knowledge of good books, and for enlarging the means of public access to them." They protested, in Jewett's address as president of the Convention: "Our wishes are for the public, not for ourselves."

---

[1] There is a short account of them, with some statistics, in Chapter XV of the 1876 *Report* of the U. S. Bureau of Education, *Public Libraries in the U. S. A.* It may interest Catholics to know that the "Catholic Philopatrian Literary Institute" of Philadelphia was founded, with a library, in 1850, a year before the first Y. M. C. A. library.

[2] John Jacob Astor devised the library by his will of 1839, nine years before he died. In 1849 the library was incorporated by law as a free public library. The building to house it was constructed between 1850 and 1853, and was completed in May, 1853, four months previous to the Convention of librarians noted in the next paragraph.

The uniting of the publishers and the librarians in this venture is perfectly normal and natural in any circumstances, and almost inevitable in view of the type of library movement which was beginning to sweep over the United States.[1] Norton published in his Literary Gazette the proceedings of the meeting, which was concluded with a resolution that "this Convention be regarded as preliminary to the formation of a permanent Librarians' Association." A committee of five was appointed to draw up a constitution and by-laws for the proposed Association, and to call another meeting of the Convention to be held in Washington, D. C. But the committee took no action; the whole project fell through; nothing was heard of a Librarians' Association for twenty-three years.

3. THE AMERICAN LIBRARY ASSOCIATION

In August, 1875, Thomas Hale Williams, librarian of the Athenaeum, Minneapolis, suggested that a national meeting of librarians and publishers be called in connection with the Centennial Exposition which was to be staged in Philadelphia the following year.[2] Melvil Dewey, a young man of twenty-four, a graduate of Amherst in 1874 and then its librarian, volunteered to appoint a committee to summon the librarians and make arrangements for their meeting on October 4-6, 1876. Publishers and librarians to the number of 103 met at Philadelphia on the day appointed. Of this number, about one-third represented public libraries, and thirteen were women.[3] On the third day of the conference the American Library Association was organized, with Justin Winsor[1] elected as president and Dewey as secretary.

---

[1] Publishers, editors and booksellers have always been interested in library associations in the United States. The Attendance Summaries of the 59th Annual Conference of the American Library Association, which was attended by 4,477 librarians, show that there were also in attendance 637 editors, commercial agents, and others. (*Bulletin of the American Library Association*, 31:919. 15 October, 1937.)

[2] *Public Libraries in the U. S. A.*, Special Report, U. S. Bureau of Education, 1876, p. xxvii.

[3] At the first meeting of librarians, in 1853, there were no women; at the 1938 meeting of the A. L. A. there were nearly eight women to each man. Robert S. Alvarez, "Women's Place in Librarianship," in *Wilson Bulletin*, 13:175-178, (November, 1938), presents a statistical estimate of the extent to which women have taken over library work in the United States and membership in the A. L. A.

For thirty years, the A. L. A. had no permanent headquarters. Its office followed the whereabouts of its annually elected secretary. A Publishing Board had been organized in 1886, and was able to offer temporary headquarters for the Association at Boston from 1906 to 1908. In 1909, the Chicago Public Library became host to the American Library Association, and for nearly fifteen years provided it with free quarters, until it set itself up in its own building in Chicago. From 1902 onward, when Andrew Carnegie gave the Association $100,000.00, it has been the steady recipient of Carnegie gifts.[2]

The American Library Association is as characteristically American as one of the big oil or steel companies. Its history, through the more than sixty years of its existence, is an interesting display of energy, organizing skill, versatility, and zeal. When one considers the fact that most of its members are salaried employees, with comparatively little freedom of action, one is astonished at how much power the Association has developed, in part through skilful use of publicity, in part through allying itself with the strong educational associations and with the Library of Congress as a channel to governmental influence and prestige. It has been staffed by men and women who possessed both ability and generosity, and who have shown a devotion to their ideals that commands the admiration even of those who question the validity of their ideals.

---

[1] Justin Winsor (1831-1897), son of a wealthy merchant of Boston, was librarian of the Boston Public Library from 1868 to 1877, then became librarian of Harvard College. He was president of the A. L. A. from 1876 to 1885. Winsor was one of the comparatively few American librarians who were also scholars. He is known for his historical writings, particularly the *Narrative and Critical History of America,* 8 vols., 1884-1889. Not long after the founding of the A. L. A., when the question of library schools came up, Winsor expressed himself as doubtful of their need or value. (George B. Utley, *Fifty Years of the American Library Association,* Chicago, 1926, p. 19.)

[2] In 1900, Carnegie was making $25,000,000.00 yearly from his steel business. He sold out to the U. S. Steel Corporation in 1901, for $250,000,000.00. Amongst his many benefactions, his library gifts seem to have had first place in his mind. (*Dictionary of American Biography,* III, 503, 505.)

In 1937, the American Library Association had 14,204 members, of whom 10,553 were librarians of various ranks.[1] Its headquarters staff is organized in five departments: Administrative; Information and Advisory Services; Library Education and Personnel; Publishing and Co-operative Services; and Membership Organization and Information.[2] Its endowment funds in 1937 totalled $2,194,645.39, of which considerably more than two millions came from Carnegie or the Carnegie Corporation.[3]

There are twelve other national library associations in the United States, five of which are affiliated with the American Library Association. Of the seventy-seven state and regional library associations, forty-two, mostly state library associations, are also affiliated with the A. L. A.; and seven of the sixty-two library clubs are organized as chapters of the A. L. A.[4] The policies of the Association have, therefore, a great deal of direct influence upon other library associations. Their indirect influence is, perhaps, equally great, through the prestige and well-deserved publicity built up about the A. L. A.

In its Constitution, the American Library Association defines its "Object" as: "To promote library service and librarianship."[5] From time to time it has amplified that brief statement into a fairly elaborate series of "Objectives."[6] Whilst these objectives have been variously phrased at different times, they lend themselves in general to support the following analysis of the functions of the American Library Association:

1. To serve as a trade union for librarians, promoting increases in salaries, determination of rank within the province of librarianship and by comparison with administrative school ranking, enlarging the field of library work in various ways, not least through working for governmental subsidies, securing certification of librarians and pensions for librarians.

2. To encourage the development of library techniques and work toward uniformity in library practices.

---

[1] *Bulletin of the American Library Association,* 31:H-358. (November, 1937.)
[2] *Ibid.,* 31:H-14.
[3] *Ibid.,* 31:H-40.
[4] *Ibid.,* 31:H-41 - H-60.
[5] *Ibid.,* 31:H-7.
[6] *Ibid.,* 31:H-5.

3. To act as a clearing house, in gathering and publicizing library statistics, publishing bibliographic and technical books, and arranging scholarship and fellowship appointments.

4. To regulate library schools, and standardize training for library work, both directly through its own Board and through the educational associations and the State and Federal governments.

The activities of the American Library Association in these four functions have been persistent, courageous, and admirably co-ordinated. They are the foundation for the assurance that radiates from the Association, and for the confidence which it inspires in its members that it will continue to be the largest single force in the development of American library practices, possibly even after the Federal government enters into the control of libraries as an adjunct to the Federal control of schools which seems to be on the way.

4. Associations of Catholic Librarians

Until well on into the twentieth century, Catholic librarians were singularly unworried about any problems of library associations. They had no association of their own; and they took only a perfunctory interest in other library associations. A few individual Catholic librarians, mostly in the employ of public libraries, were members of the American Library Association; but only one Catholic library seems to have joined the Association as early as 1912, and most of the Catholic librarians and libraries now members of the A. L. A. appear to have become members only after the formation of the first separate and distinctive Catholic library group in 1922.

This fact does not imply any active hostility on the part of Catholic librarians toward the American Library Association. It is quite certain that many Catholic librarians, working away quietly in their own small libraries, were scarcely aware of the existence of the American Library Association. Of the Catholic librarians who did know of the functions of the Association, a very small minority, possibly one in a hundred, were much impressed by its power, prestige, assurance, and driving energy. But to the majority of Catholic librarians the American Library Association had little attraction. These librarians were, for the most part, members of religious orders vowed to voluntary poverty, and therefore they had no personal interest in the trade union aspect of the Association. They worked in small libraries, not at all concerned about uniformity with other libraries in their classification and cataloguing of books. They had enough knowledge of the Catholic tradition in education to know that the spirit of exploitation of the book, the enormous hopes placed in mere reading, which were fostered by the American Library Association, were an alien thing, an outgrowth of that naturalism and humanitarian religion developed in the non-Catholic world during the nineteenth century. It would have been intolerance and impertinence on their part to condemn the American Library Association for adhering to a theory of education in which it believed; but it would have been a betrayal of their own traditions and beliefs to approve of it. They did the only thing they could do; they stood aside from the activities of the American Library Association.

But Catholic librarians could not escape forever the tremendous influence of the naturalistic library movement in the United States. In the period around 1920, that influence began to be exerted more vigorously, through the educational "standardizing agencies." The pressure of standardization had already brought about the formation, in 1904, of the Catholic Educational Association, which, prefixing "National" to its title after 1927, is still in existence. The reaction of the Catholic schools to the forces of regimentation, as it is shown in the Proceedings of the Catholic Educational Association, was not clear or decisive. It impresses one as being blended of irritation, fear, and bewilderment in a large enough proportion to make the total Catholic school attitude uncertain. Some Catholic educational leaders welcomed the vogue of standardization; some resisted it; most of them worked, not very clearly, toward some sort of compromise with it.

A. The Library Section of the Catholic Educational Association

It was in the midst of this situation that the Reverend Paul J. Foik, C.S.C., then librarian of the University of Notre Dame, presented to the Catholic Educational Association, at its meeting in Cincinnati, 29 June, 1921, a request for "the establishment of some organization within the Association dealing with library problems as they affect education."[1] The proposal was considered for a year, during which time Father Foik was to sound out the Catholic librarians on their desire to have a Library Section in the Catholic Educational Association. A questionnaire sent to 2,166 Catholic universities, colleges, seminaries, and high schools was answered by 267, about one in eight. Of the 267, a little less than one-third promised to send a representative to such an assembly of librarians.

The small number of favorable replies has been sneered at often by those who seemed either not to know or not to appreciate that most of the librarians in question, irrespective of their attitude toward the naturalistic enthusiasm for libraries, were in poverty-stricken schools, and that the single question of travelling expenses made the proposed meeting of librarians fantastic to hundreds of them. The fact that as many as eighty-six librarians in Catholic schools agreed to take up the proposal was to Father Foik abundant encouragement to go ahead with his project. The formation of a Library Section was authorized by the Catholic Educational Association in 1922, at the Philadelphia convention.[2]

The Library Section of the Catholic Educational Association continued in existence for nine years. During the first seven years, Father Foik was its chairman, and the Reverend Colman J. Farrell, O.S.B., its secretary. Even before it held any formal meetings, what was to be its main venture in library work had been suggested in a paper on "A Catholic Index to Periodicals," read at the Catholic Educational Association's convention, in 1922, by Mr. William Stetson Merrill, then one of the librarians in the Newberry Library.[3]

In the next few years, this proposal was followed by a number of others: "A Union Catalogue of Historical Literature in Catholic Libraries";[4] "A Revision of the Decimal Classification for

---

[1] *Catholic Educational Association Bulletin,* 18:107-109. (November, 1921.)

[2] *Ibid.,* 19:101-102. (November, 1922.)

[3] *Ibid.,* 19:139-144. (November, 1922.)

[4] *Ibid.,* 21:279. (November, 1924.)

Religion" and "Uniform Nomenclature for Use in Catholic Libraries";[1] a wildly impracticable scheme of compiling book orders of Catholic libraries as a guide to book selection;[2] and various surveys of Catholic libraries and librarians.[3] Committees were appointed to carry out these projects. In some cases the committees apparently did nothing; in others they did not get beyond discussion.

There was an atmosphere of hurry and impatience about much of the work of the Library Section. One gets the impression that a few of the Catholic librarians, struck by the numbers, wealth, and prestige of the American Library Association, wanted to achieve in a few years, and under great handicaps, something like the position attained by the American Library Association after fifty years. These restless members of the Library Section alternated between enthusiasm and despair, now planning great co-operative schemes, impossible to the feeble Library Section, now turning everything over to the guidance of the American Library Association.

As early as 1926, the secretary of the Library Section presented a resolution to the effect that the Catholic librarians should all join the American Library Association.[4] In 1928, Mr. Carl H. Milam, secretary of the American Library Association, addressed the annual meeting of the Library Section, and invited it to affiliate with his Association.[5] In 1929, a resolution was passed that the larger Catholic high school libraries should have

---

[1] *Ibid.*, 22:266-267, for both. (November, 1925.)

[2] *Ibid.*, 24:274. (November, 1927.)

[3] These surveys popped up every now and then. Apparently none was ever completed; at least no results of any have been published. They are touched upon in various issues of the *C. E. A. Bulletin;* but see especially 27:190-191, (November, 1930) for a proposed survey to be made by Francis E. Fitzgerald on an A. L. A. grant-in-aid from the Carnegie Corporation.

[4] *Catholic Educational Association Bulletin,* 23:280. (November, 1926.) At the time, the secretary himself was not a member of the A. L. A., and according to the records of the A. L. A. did not become a member until 1931.

[5] *Ibid.*, 25:317. (November, 1928.) Mr. Milam's actual words were: "We hope that in the future, the library work of the Catholic Educational Association may be more closely identified with our organization. It is with pleasure that we learn of the steps which are being taken looking toward the affiliation of your library section with the American Library Association." (*Ibid.*, 25:332-333.)

"a full-time librarian who is a college graduate, and has completed at least one year in an accredited library school."[1] At that time, no Catholic library school had been "accredited." In 1930, that resolution was backed up by another recommending "trained librarians according to the standards of the Board of Education for Librarianship of the American Library Association."[2]

The history of the one venture seriously attempted by the Library Section, *The Catholic Periodical Index,* does not properly belong in this brief sketch; hence we can only touch lightly upon it. The project was entered into with more courage than discretion. Father Foik, who for seven years had worked patiently and prudently toward its realization, was brushed aside by a more impetuous group, who succeeded in publishing two volumes, for 1930 and 1931, and then got into bad financial difficulties. It is hoped that *The Catholic Periodical Index* will resume publication in the near future.[3]

The Library Section was limited in its power to assume financial responsibilities, and might not commit the Catholic Educational Association to its obligations. For that reason, as also because of the eagerness of a few librarians to emulate the American Library Association in form as well as in power, there were hints, even as far back as 1924, of a desire to separate the Library Section from the Catholic Educational Association and make it an independent organization. At the Philadelphia convention, 1931, Mr. Francis E. Fitzgerald, the chairman, proposed such a separate organization; and Father Foik drafted a petition to that effect and submitted it in the final session of the Catholic Educational Association. In contrast to the deliberation, ten years earlier, about

[1] *Ibid.*, 26:233. (November, 1929.)

[2] *Ibid.*, 27:194. (November, 1930.)

[3] In 1929, Mr. Francis E. Fitzgerald, a young, energetic, and ambitious librarian, succeeded Father Foik as chairman of the Library Section. He began issuing a mimeographed *Catholic Library World,* which after his departure was printed. He took over the editorship of the *Catholic Periodical Index,* gathered a reserve fund of some $3,800.00 for its publication, and secured subscriptions. On 30 December, 1929, he assembled the co-operating indexers at the Drake Hotel, Chicago, and created an Editorial Board, of which he made himself a member. That same afternoon, the Editorial Board met again in a brief session at which "Miss M. Lillian Ryan made the motion that the Editorial Board authorize the Chairman of the Library Section to expend any sum he deems necessary to conduct the business of the *Catholic Periodical Index.* The motion was seconded and carried by vote." (*Catholic Library World,* 1:12; January, 1930.)

forming the Library Section, the Catholic Educational Association, now alarmed at the financial situation of the Library Section, acted immediately and, on 25 June, 1931, gave its hasty blessing to the formation of the Catholic Library Association.

B. The Catholic Library Association

In the resolutions offered by the Library Section and accepted by the National Catholic Educational Association it was stipulated that the newly created Catholic Library Association would "meet concurrently with the annual convention of the National Catholic Educational Association when feasible."[1] The Reverend William M. Stinson, S.J., librarian of Boston College, who had drawn up a constitution for the Library Section which was accepted by vote at the very meeting that saw the Library Section change into the Catholic Library Association, was elected the first president of the new organization. Mr. Fitzgerald continued as editor of the *Catholic Periodical Index* and treasurer of the Catholic Library Association.[2]

Father Stinson promptly found that he had inherited a good deal of grief. The treasurer apparently had no accounts to render beyond unpaid debts amounting to nearly $4,000.00. The reserve fund of the *Catholic Periodical Index* and the moneys received through subscriptions and through sales of copies of the *Index*, variously estimated at between $9,000.00 and $11,000.00, were non-existent; and the treasurer refused to make any statement accounting for the money. Charges of defalcation were in the air.[3] The H. W. Wilson Co. brought civil suit against the treasurer to recover $2,600.00 due for printing the *Catholic Periodical Index.* On the eve of trial, the treasurer confessed judgment and promised to pay in installments; but he proved to be insolvent, and Mr. Wilson agreed to carry on the *Catholic Periodical Index* and try to repay himself out of possible future profits.[1]

---

[1] *National Catholic Association Bulletin,* 28:171. (November, 1931.) See also the summary of minutes, and full text of resolutions, in the *Catholic Library World,* 3:3. (September, 1931.)

[2] *N. C. E. A. Bulletin,* 28:169. Mr. Fitzgerald's name appears as treasurer in the *Catholic Library World* up to 15 October, 1932.

[3] The present writer, who had known Mr. Fitzgerald as a student in Creighton University, has always defended him against the accusation of any wilful dishonesty. In spite of the ugly look of the procedure of 30 December, 1929, in the unwarranted grant of financial freedom given him by his hastily created Editorial Board (which, of course, had no jurisdiction over funds of the Library Section), the writer believes that Mr. Fitzgerald was only incompetent, not dishonest.

Father Stinson continued as president of the Catholic Library Association until 1934, when he was succeeded by the Reverend Peter J. Etzig, C.SS.R., who served as president until he was drowned at Oconomowoc, 8 June, 1936. The vice-president, Mr. Paul R. Byrne, librarian of the University of Notre Dame, automatically became president at Father Etzig's death. In June, 1937, the Reverend Albert C. O'Brien, O.F.M., librarian of St. Bonaventure College, was elected president, but died suddenly as the result of an accident on July 12 of the same year, to be succeeded again by the vice-president, the Reverend Colman J. Farrell, O.S.B., librarian of St. Benedict's College, Atchison, Kansas. Mr. Byrne became secretary-treasurer, and set up the headquarters of the Catholic Library Association at the University of Notre Dame.[2]

Anyone who reads over the nine volumes of the *Catholic Library World* must be struck by the evident wavering and uncertainty in the policy of the Catholic Library Association. The uncertainty is not at all concealed by the abundant use of enthusiastic adjectives, and the repetitions of assurance which sound a good deal like whistling to keep up one's courage. The financial difficulties of the *Catholic Periodical Index*, of which there had been no further issue after the 1931 volume, were a drag upon the spirits of the Association. But the vacillations regarding policy were an even greater drag. The Association seemed unable to formulate objectives that were practicable and acceptable to the Catholic librarians of the United States. There was repeated tinkering with the Constitution and By-Laws, representing bewildered efforts to define the working purposes of the Association.

But the difficulty lay farther back than in the wording of the Constitution; it lay in a decided difference of opinion between two parties in the Catholic Library Association. One was a small, but strongly coherent, minority of librarians who were enthusiasts for the whole American library movement, uncritical admirers of the

---

[1] *Catholic Library World,* 3:53. (April, 1932.) The Marion Barrows there referred to as another creditor of the Catholic Library Association, had done the actual editing of the *Catholic Periodical Index,* and has struggled with its problems until recently.

[2] *Catholic Library World,* 9:5, 39, 45. (December, 1937.)

American Library Association, and resentfully scornful of Catholic conservatism in library work. Four of these librarians sought and obtained scholarship or fellowship grants from the American Library Association,[1] and were properly grateful. The rest of the minority group contrasted the driving force, the secure financial position, the general *élan* of the American Library Association with the vagueness, poverty, and hesitation of the Catholic Library Association, and sincerely believed that the latter must lean upon the American Library Association, and even merge with it, if it was to have any real vitality.

The larger group was made up of the majority of Catholic librarians, whose traditions and principles made them vaguely distrustful of the pushing, aggressive movement based upon "salvation by books," and who were conscious of the neglect, if not contempt, with which that movement regarded Catholic books and Catholic principles regulating the use of books.

This large group was relatively inarticulate, diffident in the face of the material power and drive of the non-Catholic movement, pacifically inclined to avoid any row about policies in their own Association, and content to work out the problems of their libraries, mostly small libraries, without any worry about uniformity between their practices and those of other libraries.

The very small minority group was ambitious, persistent, extremely vocal, and self-confident.[2] It was eager to attend meetings, and to make itself heard on all occasions. As has happened over and over again, in nations as well as in small associations, the coherent minority ultimately dominated the scattered and timid majority.

With the accession of Father Farrell to the presidency, the tendency to look to the American Library Association for leadership, of which there had been indications for several years, became a definite policy. In an editorial first published, 20 November, 1937, in *The Mount Mirror,* a small periodical issued by a girls' school, the new president deftly brought in the Vatican Library and even Pope Pius XI as backers of his plea for the American library movement.[1] He further emphasized his policy for the Catholic Library Association by dissociating its meeting from that of the National Catholic Educational Association, and joining in the programme of the American Library Association at Kansas City, 13-18 June, 1938. In protest against this maneuvering, some of the Catholic libraries withdrew from the Catholic Library Association.

---

[1] For these grants, see *N. C. E. A. Bulletin,* 27:190-191 (November, 1930); *Catholic Library World,* 3:62 (May, 1932); 4:70 (May, 1933); 5:79 (June, 1934); and 6:16 (October, 1934).

[2] Exact figures on the size of these two groups are impossible. The membership of the C. L. A. for 1935 is given as 285 individuals and 94 institutions. (A. B. Cote, O.P. *The Catholic Library Association,* 1936; pp. 36-48.) The writer estimates that the minority group numbered less than ten percent of those members.

In his statement of objectives for the Catholic Library Association, the president fell back upon vague generalizations;[2] but became unrealistically specific when he lectured "Catholic educational administrators," insisting, in face of the fact that there are only ten Catholic libraries in the United States even claiming 100,000 volumes, that "the previous experience of the chief librarians (in Catholic libraries) should have been in important positions in ably administered libraries of more than 100,000 volumes."[3] This is an excellent instance of sawing off the limb on which one is sitting, since the prescription, if acted upon, would disqualify both Father Farrell himself and all but one of the officials of the Catholic Library Association. The prescription would also mean, of course, that the spirit and practices of the large non-Catholic libraries should be imported into Catholic libraries.

5. SOME PROBLEMS OF ASSOCIATION AMONGST CATHOLIC LIBRARIANS

The Catholic librarians of the United States have now been experimenting with a library association for more than sixteen years. They began their experiments in a temper of chagrin over the relatively slow growth of Catholic libraries, both in size and in elaboration of techniques, yet with great hopes of what might be done by means of organization. If we take membership in their associations as a criterion, the hopes have never been shared by more than one-tenth of the Catholic librarians.

---

[1] This article was reprinted in the *Catholic Library World,* 9:20-22. (December, 1937.)

[2] *Catholic Library World,* 10:3. (October, 1938.)

[3] *Ibid.,* 10:8. (October, 1938.)

Although scarcely any of the Catholic librarians had made a serious study of the functions of the American Library Association, and only a handful were even members of that Association, it was humanly impossible that the shadow of the American Library Association should not fall across the Catholic beginnings in forming their own library group. Deference toward, and perhaps a little envy of, the power and prestige of the American Library Association, most naturally influenced the attitude of some of those who have pioneered during the past sixteen years in the work of organizing the Catholic librarians. They began their work with a sense of inferiority, which developed into a sort of bafflement before the problems they found confronting them, and in time became an irritated impatience. But the problems still remain. We must look at them a little in detail.

A. Problems of Dispersion

The first batch of problems to be faced by any association of Catholic librarians arise out of the fact that the Catholic librarians are so widely separated from one another. The separation is geographic, to begin with. Our 4,000 Catholic librarians are scattered from Boston to Seattle, from Minneapolis to Tampa. That dispersion of possible members is, of course, a problem for any national organization; but it becomes a little more acute for the Catholic librarians because very few of them can afford to pay travelling expenses. The proposal to supplement national meetings of Catholic librarians by regional and local meetings, which was first rejected, then fumblingly accepted, may help in some measure to ease the geographic difficulty.

Catholic librarians are also dispersed by the very character of their work, which for most of them is isolated work, done by overburdened people, who have little or no freedom to move about in social contacts with other librarians. There is no sense in railing at the heads of Catholic schools for that situation. They have neither the personnel nor the money to set up full-time librarians and to give them facilities for foregathering with other librarians. Moreover, it is at most assumed, not proven, that such an expenditure would justify itself in educational results.

A third problem of dispersion has its origin in the petty rivalries and jealousies that afflict librarians as they afflict all other persons: in this case, rivalries amongst the various orders and congregations, and between sections of the country. Although similar rivalries are found in other organizations, they appear more impressive amongst Catholic librarians by contrast with the religious profession of universal charity made by the rival elements. Perhaps, also, they do gather a little intensity from the pronounced individualism, in all questions outside of the Catholic faith and discipline, which seems to be a mark of Catholics.

Regional meetings, properly managed, again would seem to be of help in overcoming this source of division amongst Catholic librarians. Formal meetings, with long papers and set discussions, may be of little use here, perhaps even, by their very formality, may cause new jealousies over places on the programme; but informal meetings, with plenty of friendly conversation and scope for off-the-record discussion, conceivably could create a sense of fellowship amongst Catholic librarians that would break down their rivalries and build up instead a strengthening solidarity.

A clever use of the *Catholic Library World,* not as a sounding board for a few individuals, but as a genuine purveyor of regional and local library news, might go a long way toward tying together East and West, North and South. Whether or not such a service is within the competency of a Catholic library association, is an open question. There is no evidence that Catholic librarians excel as journalists. It is, moreover, as the past editors of the *Catholic Library World* well know, very difficult to gather Catholic library news. The ordinary hum-drum work of librarians produces little of news value; busy librarians have little leisure to send in news; and the poor editor is driven to accept the copy of publicity hunters.

B. Problems of Personnel

The Catholic librarians of the United States are made up of two main groups: those that work in Catholic school libraries; and those that work in various non-Catholic libraries. The first group is much the larger of the two, probably more than nine-tenths of the total number of Catholic librarians. Its interests are, beyond question, the dominant interests of any association of Catholic librarians. That majority group can again be subdivided as composed of Catholic Sisters, priests, lay brothers, and seculars, of numerical strength in the order named, the Sisters outnumbering the others at least four to one.[1]

As religious women, the Catholic Sisters have little range of initiative. They are dependent, not only as all school librarians are dependent on the policies of their school administrators, but with the special dependence of persons under a vow of obedience and in a tradition of cloistered discipline. That is the life they have voluntarily chosen; it calls for no regrets. Hence they are not, as a group, very articulate about the library programmes in their schools, nor very aggressive about library policies in general. Indeed, one is frankly rather shocked at the rare exceptions to this rule of modest reserve in the Catholic Sisters who are librarians.

There has been some impatience shown over this inarticulate diffidence of such a large majority of Catholic librarians. There has been at times an even greater display of failure to understand it. The majority of Catholic librarians restrain themselves from rushing into speech and print about library work and library associations, not because they are witless sheep, or are without principles and opinions regarding their work, but because they respect the Catholic and religious tradition of modesty, and also, we may suspect, because they have a sense of humor which keeps them aware of the futility of much loud discussion amongst essentially dependent librarians.

The recorded Proceedings of the Library Section and the Catholic Library Association show that the bulk of the discussion at their meetings has been carried on by less than twenty librarians. On those occasions, as happens so often in assemblies, the most vocal librarians have not always been the most intelligent and competent present, but, quite naturally, the most ambitious and aggressive. Hence it is not entirely to the discredit of the Catholic librarians that the majority have grinned in silence whilst the very tiny minority wrestled volubly with confused proposals expounded in unimpressive English. But it might have been a great gain if the majority had been a little more outspoken in emphasizing the Catholic cultural tradition in library work. It might have been a gain—or it might have been only another row.

---

[1] This estimate is based on the statistics published by the Department of Education, National Catholic Welfare Conference, in the *Directory,* 1936. See the summaries of number of instructors in each of the divisions above the elementary schools.

C. Problems of Objectives

The primary problem of objectives in any association of Catholic librarians is the very difficult one of holding fast to the Catholic tradition in a non-Catholic environment. It is a problem which the librarians share intimately with all who are engaged in Catholic education. We Catholics are justly proud of our courage and our sacrifices in keeping up our own system of schools and libraries. At the elementary level, we have assurance as well as pride in our work; we are confident of its Catholic character. Above that level, we have been subjected to extraordinary pressure, both from "standardizing agencies" and, perhaps even more powerfully, from the vague snobbery rampant in modern civilization, which makes of "what every one else is doing" an enormous coercive force. We have drifted into all sorts of imitations of non-Catholic procedures in schools and libraries, sometimes unwittingly, sometimes with an eye upon only immediate results, in hopes of increased enrollment and the like, whilst blind to the ultimate tendencies of the practices we are copying.

The tragic situation of Catholic schools with regard to one particular, the abandonment of liberal culture for vocationalism, has been aptly summed up in this statement: "We are in the strange position of denying the whole philosophy which gave vocationalism the entry and the dominance in modern education, yet of attempting to imitate the secular schools in the product of this philosophy."[1] Quite the same may be said about Catholic librarians imitating the programme of the naturalistic library movement whilst vehemently condemning naturalism itself.

---

[1] George D. Bull, S.J., "Present Tendencies in Our Educational System," a paper read at the meeting of the Jesuit Educational Association, Marquette University, Milwaukee, 22 April, 1938.

It is not suggested here that the objectives of Catholic library associations can or should completely ignore library techniques, or repudiate every modern library practice. But it is definitely suggested that Catholic librarians should skilfully and vigilantly discriminate in adopting library procedures; that they should test them against the long tradition of Catholic education, in which library work is only a minor part; that they should take into account the actual resources, as well as aims, of our school libraries; and that their associations should be just as vigorous in guarding them against unsuitable library practices as in urging them to study and use the sound elements of library techniques developed outside of our culture.

No association of Catholic librarians can adopt fully the objectives of, say, the American Library Association, without unwittingly approving of the philosophy back of those objectives. Nor will it suffice to insert the adjective "Catholic" in front of statements of objectives which implicitly go counter to the Catholic tradition. It is that tradition which must determine acceptable objectives in a Catholic library association; and not least through an appreciation of the limited hopes placed in mere reading by the sanity of Catholic philosophy. Objectives that exaggerate the place of the library in schools, that make the use of books a panacea in education, tend to destroy the supremacy in education of the parents and teachers, and even to challenge the dispensations of grace through revelation and the sacraments. That challenge has been more than made by the men and women who created the modern library movement; it cannot be supported by Catholic libraries.

D. Problems of Leadership

It is a delicate matter to discuss the problems of leadership in association of Catholic librarians. To be honest in such discussion is to run a risk of offending against charity or courtesy. Those who seek or accept the onerous task of leadership deserve consideration and sympathy quite as certainly as they are also subject to criticism. Their task is an extremely difficult one. It calls for qualities that are not at all common. A leader must be aggressive; else he does not lead at all. He must also be restrained by a sense of proportion, a sense of values, a sense of humor; else he has only energy without direction. The combination is rare. A great teacher used to complain whimsically of people who "suffered from a rush of brains to the head." That phenomenon occurs also amongst leaders of librarians: a display of zeal that outruns knowledge, of impetuosity that becomes impatience, of energy without secure directions, or, in baseball language, of speed without control.

In our pagan and naturalistic environment, the leaders of Catholic librarians in their associations are leaders in a hostile terrain. The fellowship newly built up amongst librarians of every sort is an admirable thing; but it should not blind the Catholic leaders to the enormous differences in view between the Catholic librarians and their charming, aggressive, and achieving fellow-librarians in an alien culture. In contrast to their numbers and their power, we are the *pusillus grex,* of our Lord's designation; not the leaders of the world for which He "did not pray." We are in many ways content that the world should surpass us in material achievements, in libraries as in so many other things; that "the children of this world are wiser in their generation than the children of light." We are not, let us hope, smug about our better gifts; but no humility over the fact that all that we have has been given us can obscure the excellence of our gifts, or make us anxious for a place in this world which our gifts can never command.

In practice, then, the main problem of leadership amongst Catholic librarians is the problem of "casting away ambition," of recognizing the minor rôle of Catholic librarians in a world which has almost incredibly magnified the librarian's job. Catholic librarians are a fairly docile lot; the Sisters in particular welcome the leadership of priests. So much the more important is it that this docility be not betrayed by a fretful impatience to enlarge Catholic library work beyond its proper sphere, by irritation over the slow library growth of schools struggling with poverty, by delusions of emulating the powerful non-Catholic library associations. It is, unfortunately, an historical fact that the associations of Catholic librarians have suffered from that sort of well-intentioned, but ill-advised, leadership.

What the future leadership of Catholic librarians will bring, God only knows. But it is not likely that it will bring grandiose achievements in large membership of Catholic library associations, or expensive and impressive bibliographic publications, or contentious "rank" of librarians alongside of school executives, or lavish salaries paid to secular librarians by financially straitened Catholic schools, or even a footing of equality with the non-Catholic library associations. Our material, moral, and cultural conditions seem to negative any such hopes. Perhaps it will bring a simpler friendliness into the relations of Catholic librarians who are within reach of each other; an informal sharing of experiences, projects, views, amongst themselves; a balance and sanity about the place of library work in Catholic schools; a shrewder recognition of the barriers set up by every grouping of men and women into separate social organizations; and an acceptance of the barriers of Catholic culture as safeguards of a precious inheritance. That would be a solution of some of our problems of leadership in associations of Catholic libraries.

NOTE

Repeatedly throughout this small book reference has been made to "the Catholic tradition in education." It may be objected that the expression is vague, and that it needs defining if it is to be operative as a test of library work. There *is* a vagueness about "the Catholic tradition in education," just as there is in such expressions as "culture" or "civilization" or "art": the vagueness of large content which can only be hinted at in any compact phrase. Yet none of these is as vague as "modern progress," the shibboleth so unquestioningly accepted by all who impatiently thrust aside the long centuries of accumulated knowledge, experience, and wisdom, natural and supernatural, in favor of revolutionary movements that are as uncertain of their direction as they are ignorant of their origin.

Many Catholics who are unable to define "the Catholic tradition in education" yet know what it is; just as they know what "patriotism" is, or "democracy," and can distinguish a patriot from a jingo, and a democratic government from the regimes of Moscow or Berlin or Valencia. Not a few non-Catholics, equally unable to define "the Catholic tradition in education," are also aware of what it is. In the sixteenth edition of a handbook to be found in many libraries, a prophecy that Catholic schools will go the way of the former Protestant schools in the United States is rounded out with this comment: "Of course this will not appeal to those who consider that all that happens on this earth is of no importance, that all that counts is getting to heaven and that the only way is through the good graces of the Roman hierarchy who are in close touch with God."[1]

Beneath the sneer and the malevolence, this man who scorns and hates the Catholic tradition in education has caught the core of its meaning. Quite cheerfully we accept the statement that "all that happens on this earth is of no importance" in comparison with the importance of getting to heaven, and that our way to heaven is guided by infallible authority exercised by men otherwise just like ourselves. That question of proportion is at the heart of the Catholic tradition in education. "What doth it profit a man?" is a detailed test of values as well as a general test.

---

[1] Porter Sargent, *A Handbook of Private Schools*, Boston, 1932, p. 40.

History disproves the accusation that the Catholic culture is obscurantist, so "other-worldly" that it has no wisdom, no achievement, in this life. The men who make the accusation are themselves debtors to centuries of Catholic cultural achievements. But it is the Catholic way to reckon achievements for time as small matters beside eternal achievements. It is the Catholic tradition to be grateful for the wisdom and the achievements of the past, to be serene about the revolutionary changes that men clamorously hail as "progress," to accept our limitations and inequalities of intelligence in managing mundane affairs, and, through both contemplation of the past and adjustment to the present, to keep the final goal of education before us a guide.

Getting a man into heaven is, we believe, more important than getting him into a library. If one can do both, well and good; but if either must give way to the other, it is the library that must go. And when we do get the man into the library, we know from experience that he cannot always use the library intelligently, and we are more concerned about what he reads and how he reads than about the simple fact that he does read. Quantitative estimates of library work leave us cold. Large and expensive buildings, the "latest books," a scurrying library staff, do not forcibly impress the Catholic tradition in education. In the palatial library, it remembers that incarnate Wisdom was born in a stable, and that librarians come and go, but Wisdom remains. That tradition does not despise erudition, yet it sets erudition below patience and humility and charity. That tradition has seen empires rise and decay and die away, and learning strut its brief parade, and the barbarian and fanatic destroy books and libraries, and new knowledge grow out of chaos; and as it looks back upon all these things, it recalls that the genius who created the *philosophia perennis* thought more of his crucifix than of his books.

We cannot cage the Catholic tradition in education within a phrase, or a few paragraphs, or a book, or a whole library, any more than we can cage all the dispensations of God with men in the compass of our formulas or our ambitions or our library techniques. That tradition is, as Father Bull says, "a quality of the mind's life . . . a reality which, though ever drawn upon, in successive efforts, is yet inexhaustible."[1] But we can bow before it in reverence as the enshrining of what we value more than any "progress," as our guide to the eternal fulfillment of God's plan for men.

---

[1] George Bull, S.J., "The Function of the Catholic Graduate School," in *Thought,* 13:364-380 (September, 1938), p. 369.

APPENDIX I

There is some truth in the cynical statement that statistics are the ultimate degree of lying. Library statistics are particularly inaccurate. All too frequently they err on the side of exaggeration. Not merely are "round number" figures to be suspect, since they indicate only a guess, but even figures so detailed as to give the appearance of extreme accuracy have more than once been proven to be considerably distended. Warren and Clark, the editors of the U. S. Bureau of Education Report on *Public Libraries in the United States*, an elaborate study undertaken in 1875-1876, have an interesting chapter on "Library Reports and Statistics" (pp. 745 sqq.), in which they discuss the untrustworthiness of library statistics, even including their own. More recent efforts to gather statistical information on libraries, although most conscientiously carried out, have not solved the problem of securing completeness and reliability.

Here are some of the difficulties to be met with in a survey of libraries: 1. Not all libraries will make reports to the surveying agencies. 2. Not all librarians keep faithful records; hence not all of them have the information asked for. 3. Statisticians do not follow a uniform plan in gathering data; hence comparisons between statistics are often practically impossible, because the data overlap or do not meet. 4. Many librarians, to save their face or to make a better impression, pad their returns for number of volumes, circulation, even size of staff. 5. Theft, as well as wear and tear, makes changes in the number of library volumes not always easy to estimate accurately.

These facts should be kept in mind when one considers the following statistics about libraries in the United States.

Year	1836	1849	1857-58	1876
Number of libraries reporting 10,000 vols. or more	57	154	201	266
Total volumes reported............	580,201	1,629,315	2,722,394	6,984,882

(From *Public Libraries in U. S.*, 1876; pp. 772-773.)

Census of 1860 reported 27,730 libraries, of all kinds, with total of 13,316,379 volumes. (See report of Superintendent of Census for the jumbling in the figures. *Ibid.*, pp. 759-760.)

In the Government report of 1876, no attempt is made to square these figures with the fact that there were only 3,647 libraries reporting more than 300 volumes each, with a total of 12,276,964 volumes. (*Ibid.*, pp. 1010-1011.) The average annual increase in number of books was reported by only 1,510 libraries, less than one-third of the total that made statistical returns: hence the figure of 434,339 volumes for annual increase ceases to have any exact significance. A total of 1,365,407 volumes is offered as the book content of District School Libraries (*Ibid.*,

p. 1011) but without indication of the number of such libraries, or whether or not they may have been included in the 1860 report of 27,730 libraries.

There is an air of greater definiteness and accuracy about the U. S. Office of Education Bulletin 37, *Statistics of Public, Society, and School Libraries, 1929,* published in 1930. But the lower limit of 1,000 volumes set for libraries entered in this report destroys the basic relation between this report and that of 1876. One comparable item is that there were in 1929 1,468 libraries with more than 10,000 volumes each (p. 5), more than five times as many as in 1876.

The general figures are:

10,937 libraries reporting 1,000 volumes or more had 161,975,385 volumes in all. Of these,

6,429 libraries of more than 3,000 volumes had total of 154,316,858;
4,508 libraries of less than 3,000 volumes had total of 7,658,527.

The libraries of more than 3,000 volumes each had a total of 31,234 librarians. The number of librarians for the libraries with less than 3,000 volumes each is not given.

Of the 6,429 libraries (3,000+), 2,892 were school, college, university;
2,669 were Government public libraries;
863 were of corporations, societies.

On the question of additions to the library during the year, 3,911 of the 4,508 libraries of less than 3,000 volumes each reported a mixed "volumes and pamphlets added" of 725,911, nearly 90% reporting. But of 4,656 libraries with more than 5,000 volumes each, only 968, or about one-fifth, reported for a six-year increase in books alone. These 968 libraries alone accounted for 32,441,719 volumes of the 35,060,971 added to all libraries reporting for that period.

For 1934, Carleton B. Joeckel, *Library Service,* U. S. Gov't Printing Office, 1938, p. 30, estimates 15,800 libraries, with 224,000,000 volumes.

APPENDIX II

As has been indicated in the text, the statistical data here offered are presented as, at most, an illustration of the growth of a few Catholic libraries. They furnish no basis for any general conclusions. The information given in Table A is a selection from two reports of the U. S. Bureau (later, Office) of Education: the *Special Report, Public Libraries in the United States, 1876;* and *Statistics of Public, Society, and School Libraries, 1929,* Bulletin 37, 1930. Table B contains data supplied to the writer by the librarians of the libraries listed.

Upon comparison, the two tables may show discrepancies. The writer does not attempt to explain these discrepancies with any assurance. In some instances, it is possible that there may have been losses or withdrawals from the earlier holdings of the libraries, or a splitting up of single book collections, or a combination of several libraries now belonging to one institution. In other cases, the discrepancies may be due to the fact that the figures offered are drawn from conjectural estimates rather than from exact records.

The presence of round-number figures in Table A and Table B is almost certain evidence that there is considerable "rough estimate," or conjecture, or plain guess, in the data offered. In that connection, it is interesting to note how the round-number figures gradually disappear from the statistics of these Catholic libraries.

Thus, in Table A, of the twenty-two Catholic libraries whose number of volumes is reported for the year 1876, eighteen certainly, and probably twenty, report in round-numbers. Of the forty-one reports of number of volumes for 1929, listed in the same Table A, only twenty-five are given in round-numbers. When forty of those forty-one libraries, through private correspondence, reported their number of volumes for 1938, as listed in Table B, only fourteen offered round-number statistics.

In other words, the proportion of round-number figures diminished from over 82% in 1876 to less than 60% in 1929, and to 35% in 1938. These facts would seem to indicate that Catholic libraries are becoming more careful about keeping records or taking inventories of their book collections.

For the apparent discrepancies in some of the reported numbers of full-time librarians in Catholic libraries, a simple explanation may be that some of the reports overlooked the distinction between full-time and part-time librarians.

TABLE A

LIBRARY	Year of Foundation	Total Number of Volumes in 1876	Total Number of Volumes in 1929	Librarians in 1929
San Francisco, Calif., Univ. of San Francisco	1855	5,000	20,000	2
Santa Clara, Calif., Univ. of Santa Clara	1851	10,000	45,000	2
Cañon City, Colo., Mt. Scholastica Academy	1901		30,000	1
Washington, D. C., Catholic Univ. of America	1889		294,716	15
Washington, D. C., Georgetown University	1791	32,268		
Washington, D. C., Trinity College	1900		35,000	12
Chicago, Ill., De Paul University	1898		39,199	8
Chicago, Ill., St. Ignatius College	1870	9,000		
Chicago, Ill., St. Mary's High School	1921		10,746	1
Chicago, Ill., St. Xavier College	1912		17,825	4
Lisle, Ill., St. Procopius College	1901		21,900	1
Notre Dame, Ind., Univ. of Notre Dame	1843	10,000	137,068	12
St. Mary's, Ind., St. Mary-of-the-Woods Coll.	1840	3,000	35,430	9
Dubuque, Iowa, Clarke College			13,400	1
Dubuque, Iowa, Columbia College	1873		32,008	2
Atchison, Kas., St. Benedict's College	1859	2,000	40,000	1
Baltimore, Md., Loyola College	1852	21,500	50,000	
Baltimore, Md., St. Mary's Seminary	1791	15,000		
Emmitsburg, Md., Mt. St. Mary's College	1808	7,000	30,000	1
Woodstock, Md., Woodstock College	1869	18,000	80,000	1
Chestnut Hill, Mass., Boston College	1864	8,625	125,000	3
Detroit, Mich., University of Detroit			68,000	2
St. Paul, Minn., College of St. Catherine	1912		27,715	2
St. Louis, Mo., St. Louis University	1829	25,000	134,633	6
Webster Groves, Mo., Webster College	1916		11,318	1
Omaha, Nebr., Creighton University			41,500	4
Brooklyn, N. Y., St. Francis College	1858	13,970	10,000	2
Brooklyn, N. Y., St. John's University	1870		12,000	3
New York, N. Y., College of the Sacred Heart	1847		14,334	4
New York, N. Y., Fordham University	1840	15,000	110,000	
New York, N. Y., St. Francis Xavier College	1847	21,000	113,000	2
New York, N. Y., Manhattan College	1863	13,000	32,000	2
St. Bonaventure, N. Y., St. Bonaventure Coll.	1859		22,278	2
Cincinnati, O., Mt. St. Mary's Seminary	1849	15,100	20,000	1
Cincinnati, O., St. Xavier College	1840	17,000	68,000	1
Dayton, O., University of Dayton	1900		27,500	3
Latrobe, Pa., St. Vincent's College	1846	13,000	45,000	2
Philadelphia, Pa., Mt. St. Joseph College	1851	6,000	11,803	2
Scranton, Pa., St. Thomas College	1926		11,500	2
Villanova, Pa., Villanova College	1842	8,000	28,387	1
Austin, Tex., St. Edward's University	1920		17,550	10
San Antonio, Tex., Our Lady of the Lake Coll.	1896		20,512	1
Winooski, Vt., St. Michael's College	1904		20,000	1
West de Pere, Wis., St. Norbert's College	1899		14,000	3

TABLE B

LIBRARY	Total Number of Volumes in 1938	Increase Since 1929	Librarians in 1938
San Francisco, Calif., Univ. of San Francisco	39,970	28,438	1
Santa Clara, Calif., Univ. of Santa Clara	52,000	12,000	2
Cañon City, Colo., Mt. Scholastica Academy	2,650	100	
Washington, D. C., Catholic University of America	300,000	70,000	11
Washington, D. C. Georgetown University	200,000		4
Washington, D. C., Trinity College	43,516	8,545	3
Chicago, Ill., De Paul University	65,757	36,257	5
Chicago, Ill., Loyola University[1]	112,143	53,032	11
Chicago, Ill., St. Mary's High School	6,000	2,000	1
Chicago, Ill., St. Xavier's College	41,367	25,541	3
Lisle, Ill., St. Procopius College	28,071	8,163	
Notre Dame, Ind., Univ. of Notre Dame	188,708	41,640	10
St. Mary's, Ind., St. Mary-of-the-Woods College	49,600	14,760	2
Dubuque, Iowa, Clarke College	23,195	4,935	2
Atchison, Kas., St. Benedict's College	100,000	15,000	7
Baltimore, Md., Loyola College	26,286	2,700	1
Baltimore, Md., St. Mary's Seminary	50,000		1
Emmitsburg, Md., Mt. St. Mary's College	35,000	800	1
Woodstock, Md., Woodstock College	107,000	16,500	1
Chestnut Hill, Mass., Boston College	168,180	40,180	8
Detroit, Mich., University of Detroit	76,228	39,174	6
St. Paul, Minn., College of St. Catherine	52,530	22,650	2
St. Louis Mo., St. Louis University	174,385	54,802	6
Webster Groves, Mo., Webster College	20,582	10,000	1
Omaha, Nebr., Creighton University	104,264	24,492	6
Brooklyn, N. Y., St. Francis College	10,126	5,410	1
Brooklyn, N. Y., St. John's University	25,000	16,000	3
New York, N. Y., College of Sacred Heart	30,958	20,857	3
New York, N. Y., Fordham University	172,000	72-90,000	20
St. Bonaventure, N. Y., St. Bonaventure College	41,951	19,673	3
Cincinnati, O., Mt. St. Mary's Seminary	22,460	3,970	
Cincinnati, O., Xavier University[2]	44,902	12,013	1
Dayton, O., University of Dayton	36,600	20,100	3
Philadelphia, Pa., Mt. St. Joseph College	22,570	10,100	2
Scranton, Pa., University of Scranton[3]	13,750	10,000	3
Villanova, Pa., Villanova College	32,416	10,000	3
Austin, Texas, St. Edward's University	22,000	7,000	1
San Antonio, Texas, Our Lady of the Lake	38,580	17,924	1
Winooski, Vt., St. Michael's College	20,000	900	1
West de Pere, Wis., St. Norbert's College	16,850	5,000	1

[1] Formerly, St. Ignatius College.

[2] Formerly, St. Xavier College.

[3] Formerly, St. Thomas College.

APPENDIX III

A. REGULAE PRAEFECTI BIBLIOTHECAE

(*From Roman edition, 1607.*)

1. Indicem librorum prohibitorum in Bibliotheca habeat, et videat ne forte ullus sit inter eos ex prohibitis, aut aliis, quorum usus communis esse non debet.

2. Bibliotheca clausa sit, cujus claves ipse habeat et illis tradat, qui eas, juxta Superioris judicium, habere debebunt.

3. Libri omnes eo ordine in Bibliotheca collocentur, ut singulis facultatibus suus certus sit locus proprio titulo inscriptus.

4. Singuli libri titulis exterius inscribantur, ut facile cognosci possint.

5. Omnium librorum, qui domi sunt, catalogum habeat, diversarum facultatum auctoribus ordine alphabetico in diversas classes distributis.

6. In alio catalogo, divisis etiam per classes facultatibus, ii libri scribantur qui in nostrorum usum extra Bibliothecam concessi sunt; qui vero intra dies octo restituendi extrahuntur, in tabula in hunc usum parieti appensa notentur; quibus redditis, quod fuerat scriptum deleatur.

7. Nullum librum ex Bibliotheca cuipiam dabit sine Superioris licentia speciali, aut generali: et advertat, ne quis librum, etiam cum licentia, se inscio accipiat.

8. Curet, ut Bibliotheca valde munda, et composita sit, quam in hebdomada bis verret, et semel ex libris pulverem excutiet; cavere etiam debet, ne libri humiditate, aut alia re laedantur.

9. Quando intellexerit domi deesse aliquos libros necessarios, aut aliquos valde utiles in lucem editos esse, certiorem faciat Superiorem, ut si illi visum fuerit, emantur; si vero domi libri inutiles fuerint, eumdem admoneat, an cum aliis melioribus commutandi sint.

10. In loco publico, praesertim in magnis Collegiis, sint quidam communiores libri, quibus unusquisque, pro ratione suorum studiorum uti possit.

11. Habeat librum, in quo ea omnia judicio Superioris selecta diligenter scribantur, quae in suo Collegio publice exhibentur, ut Comediae, Dialogi, Orationes, et id genus alia: Conclusiones vero singulorum annorum, quae publice defendentur, simul consutas in Bibliotheca asservet.

12. Si aliqui libri extra domum accomodato darentur, adhibeat diligentiam ut recupererentur suo tempore, et in aliquo interim libro notabit, quinam illi libri sint, et quibus eos accomodaverit.

B. REGULAE PRAEFECTI BIBLIOTHECAE

(*From Roman edition, 1932.*)

1. Praefectus bibliothecae instrumentum est Superioris in comparandis, conservandis apteque distribuendis libris ac periodicis.
2. Bibliothecae nostrae omnes iis in primis instruantur libris quibus Sacerdotes et Religiosi potissimum indigent; tum iis etiam qui omnibus hominibus excultis ad manus esse debent. Praeterea in singulis Domibus peculiarium hujus Domus necessitatum debita ratio habeatur.
3. Observet num bibliotheca secundum talem norman aptis libris instructa sit et quibus selectis operibus, sive antiquis sive novis, augenda videatur. Caveat autem ne libri comparentur quasi fortuito, nulla certa statuta norma, solum ad postulationem Nostrorum.
4. Sciat a Superiore quae annua summa assignetur ad sumptus bibliothecae et quam facultatem ipse habeat ad libros emendos.
5. Si nemo in Provincia constitutus fuerit ut Notros in libris emendis consiliis juvet, ne omittat peritum aliquem consulere, in iis praesertim materiis in quibus minus versatus est. Nullum autem librum in bibliothecam reponat nisi prius certo sciat cujus sit valoris religiosi et moralis. Libri vero leves et mundani, quantum fieri poterit, a bibliothecis nostris arceantur.
6. Curet ut libri emendi commodo comparentur pretio, v. gr. eos cum aliis Domibus emendo, vel aliis adhibitis mediis a peritis suggerendis.
7. Libri novi et recentiores periodicorum fasciculi, apto aliquo loco, omnibus aliquamdiu inspiciendi exponantur.
8. Libri secundum certam aptamque normam in bibliotheca collocentur, et unicuique suus assignetur locus, in ipso libro inscribendus. Libri autem pretiosi peculiari cura, et ut plurimum seorsim a ceteris, serventur.
9. Libri qui omnibus frequenter utiles sunt, ut lexica, repertoria, quaedam documentorum collectiones, similia, in loco peculiari collocentur, ubi omnibus continuo praesto sint et ex quo nullo pacto (aut certis solum horis et ad brevissimum tantum tempus) auferri possint.
10. Libros qui omnibus communiter concedi solent, ut Biblia sacra, lexica quaedam, etc., novis Domus sociis distribuere curet. Provideat etiam ut cubicula hospitibus destinata aliquot libris piis instruantur, nominatim ad lectionem spiritualem instituendam et ad orationem mentalem matutinam praeparandam.
11. Libri ab Ecclesia prohibiti, qui Domi conservandi videbuntur, ita custodiantur ut ad illorum manus qui eos legendi facultatem non habeant, pervenire non possint; libri vero bonis moribus adversantes, si qui Domi servare necesse sit, cautius etiam custodiantur.
12. Librorum omnium qui Domi sunt catalogus habeatur alphabeticus, et, ut plurimum, alter praeterea, qui libros secundum materiae ordinem referat, uterque secundum normam stabilem conficiendus. Catalogis statim inscribantur et Domus nomine notentur libri omnes novi comparati vel accepti.

13. Juvabit praeterea in bibliothecis majoribus habere elenchum in quo inscribantur ex ordine libri omnes novi, sive dono recepti, addito nomine donatoris, sive empti, addito pretio emptionis.

14. Neque in ordinem secundum quem libri in bibliotheca collocantur, neque in modum catalogos conficiendi, notabilem inducat mutationem, nisi Superior Provincialem prius consulerit, et, ex peritorum judicio, mutatio non exiguum commodum allatura atque intra tempus non nimis longum absolvenda speretur.

15. Nullus liber a Nostris ex bibliotheca extrahatur, etiam ad breve tempus, nisi sedulo inscribatur vel aliter notetur; reddito vero libro, quod erat scriptum, deleatur.

16. Nullum librum ex bibliotheca cuipiam dabit sine Superioris facultate speciali vel generali. Neque ullum extra Domum commodet vel commodare sinat, nisi sibi constet de Superioris consensu, et a mutuante (etiam si sit e Nostris) syngrapham, subscripto nomine, acceperit, in qua etiam praestituatur tempus intra quod liber sit restituendus vel facultas renovanda. Persuasum autem habeat bibliothecae libros nulla re certius dispergi quam nimia facilitate in commodandis et negligentia in repetendis libris.

17. Nullum alicujus momenti librum destruat, nullum prorsus vendat sine facultate Superioris, qui eam non concedet nisi salvis legibus ecclesiasticis de alienatione bonorum, et consulto aliquo perito. Pretium autem ex librorum venditione collectum in bibliothecae utilitatem impendi debet.

18. Omni opere efficere conetur ut bibliotheca, quae in communem omnium utilitatem constituta est, reapse ad omnium dispositionem maneat; et ideo, approbante Superiore, semel saltem quotannis omnibus commendet ut libros quos ex bibliotheca habent recognoscant, eos quibus actu non indigent reponant, eos vero quibus etiamnum indigent denuo inscribant. Si quem vero animadvertat Regulis bibliothecae non raro deesse, illud Superiori significare tenetur.

19. Bibliotheca sit valde munda et composita; et caveatur, quantum fieri poterit, ne libri humiditate, solis radiis, aliave ratione laedantur. Suo autem tempore compaginentur fasciculi periodicorum et alii libri, qui hoc sumptu digni videantur.

20. Bibliotheca clausa sit iisque solis ejus clavis tradatur qui, Superioris judicio, eam habere debebunt.

21. Officii sui peritiam, praesertim si majori bibliothecae praeficiatur, ex peculiaribus tractatibus et ex aliorum experientia acquirere et fovere studeat.

22. Quae in his Regulis statuuntur, quantum res fert, iis quoque bibliothecis applicantur quae ad alicujus classis utilitatem, v. g. Scholasticorum, destinentur.

INDEX

Adult education and libraries, 16.
Aids in book selection, 66-71.
Aims of Catholic libraries, 40-43.
Akers, Susan Grey, 115.
Alexandria, library of, 3.
Alternative classification for Catholic books, 97-98.
American Catholic Historical Society, library of, 26.
American Company of Booksellers, 177.
American Library Association, 19, 20, 181-184, 187, 191, 197.
    Board of Education for Librarianship, 153, 157, 184.
    Catalog rules, 105, 106.
    Subject headings, 106, 112.
"Apostleship of the book," 121, 122, 126, 127, 128, 131, 133.
Apprenticeship of librarians, 150.
Association of American Library Schools, 152.
Associations, library, 19, 175 sqq.

Bacon's outline of classification 12 n., 78.
Bishop, William Warner, 108, 115.
Bliss, Henry Evelyn, 95.
Book lists, 67, 68.
Book production, 56-58.
    Catholic, 62-64.
    In United States, 10, 57.
Book reviews as aids in selection, 67-68.
Book selection, 55 sqq.
    Aids in, 66-71.
    Analysis of, 55.
    Catholic aspects of, 62-66.
    Criteria of, 58-62.
    Field of choice in, 56-58.
"Book, the latest," 61, 64, 133-134.
Books, early Catholic, 25.
    Repetitive character of, 67.
Bostwick, Arthur E., 151, 152, 155.
Boulliau, Ismael, 12 n., 144-145.
Brown, James Duff, 100.
Brown, John Carter, 147.
Browne, Nina E., 13.
"Browsing Rooms," 121-122.
Brussels Expansion, 95-96, 98-99.
Budget, library, 45-47.
    Allocation of, 73-74.
Bull, George D., S.J., 196, 201.
Byrne, Paul R., 190.

Carey, Matthew, 177.
Catalogue, card, 102.
    Dictionary, 104.
    Expansibility of, 102.
    Purpose of, 101 sqq.
    Rules, 104-106.
Cataloguing in Catholic libraries, 101, 108-111.
Catholic libraries, early school, 27-29.
    Growth of in schools, 27-32.
    Kinds of, 25-27.
    Library Council in, 52-53.
    Loan services, 123-125.
    Place of in education, 32-35.
    Position of in U. S., 21-25.
    Promotional services, 126-128.
    Reference services, 125-126.
    Rental, 26.
    Statistics of, 28-32, 108, 156, 163, 168, 169, 205-207.
    Subject headings in, 111 sqq.
Catholic Library Association, 162, 163, 164, 189-192.
Catholic library schools, 155-159.
    Control of, 166-167.
    First in U. S., 157.
    Statistics of, 159.
Catholic Library World, 188 n., 190, 194.

Catholic Periodical Index, 186, 188, 189, 190.
Censorship of books, 69-71.
Central Verein, library of, 26.
Certification of librarians, 160.
Circulation records, 13.
Classification Décimale Universelle, 95-96, 98.
Classification, Catholic aspects of, 88-91.
  Catholic schemes of, 93-100.
  Expansibility of, 86-88.
  Harvard Library, 94.
  Practical problems of, 91-93.
  Systems of, 76 sqq.
  Theories of, 80 sqq.
  Vatican Library, 96-97.
Congress, Library of, 13, 58, 89 n.
  Catalogue cards, 105.
  Classification scheme, 78, 79, 80, 83, 87, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 113.
  Subject headings, 106, 112.
Control of Catholic library schools, 166-168.
Cordova, Arabic library at, 3.
Cotton des Houssayes, Jean Baptiste, 146.
Council, library, 52-53.
Crerar Library, John, 39.
Criteria, Catholic, in book selection, 63-65, 69-71.
Culture, Catholic, 21 sqq., 200-202.
Cutter, Charles Ammi, 12, 13.
  Author tables, 13.
  Cataloguing rules, 104-105.
  Expansive Classification, 12, 78, 79.

Decimal classification, 77, 78, 79, 83, 87, 89, 92, 93, 94, 95, 98, 99, 100, 113, 148.
Degrees, academic, in library work, 162-163.
Dewey, Melvil, 12, 77.
  First library school, 149-150.
Detroit Public Library, program of, 15-16.
Dispersion of Catholic librarians, 193-194.
Dziatzko, Karl, 150.

Edwards, Edward, 147 n.
Ehrle, Franz Cardinal, S.J., 152.
Elective curriculum, influence of on libraries, 32-34.
English Stationers' Company, 177.
Esdaile, Arundell, 153.
Etzig, Peter J., C.SS.R., 190.
Expansive classification, Cutter's, 78, 79.
Extent of librarian training, 159, 160, 161.

Farrell, Colman J., O.S.B., 186, 187, 190, 191.
Fitzgerald, Francis E., 188, 189 n., 190.
Foik, Paul J., C.S.C., 157, 185, 186, 188.

Garnier, Jean, S.J., 12 n., 144.
Gesner's classification, 12 n.
Grassi, John, S.J., 28.
Gill, Eric, 138.
Giordani, Igino, 166.
Government support of libraries, 179-180.

Hanson, James, C.M., 78, 96, 97.
Harris, William Torrey, 12, 78.
Harvard University, library of, 8, 94
Hitchler, Theresa, 106, 111, 114.
Humanitarianism influencing library work, 148-149.
Hume, David, 145.
Huntington Library, 40.

Index of Forbidden Books, 70.
Inter-library loans, 136.

Jesuit rules for librarians, 43-45, 208-210.
Jewett, Charles Coffin, 147-148, 152, 180.

Kish, 2000 B.C., school library at, 2.

Leadership of Catholic librarians, 197-199.
Lecture method, influence of on libraries, 33.
Lessing, Gotthold Ephraim, 145.
Librarians, first convention of, 180-181.
  Numbers of in U. S., 17, 120.
  Relations of with teachers, 51-53.
  Training of, 137 sqq., 149-155.
Librarians, Catholic, associations, 37, 184 sqq.
  Authority, 36, 43-45.
  Dispersion of, 193-194.
  Numbers, 35-36.
  Objectives, 196-197.
  Personnel of, 194-196.
  Technical training, 36-37, 155-171.
Librarianship, Analysis of, 140-142.
  Art of, 138-140.
  Changing concepts of, 137 sqq.
  Education for, 142 sqq.
  Science of, 139-140.
Libraries, small, 107, 108, 112, 116, 156, 168.
Library, its place in education, 14-16.
Library schools in the United States, 18, 20, 149 sqq.
  Catholic, 155-159.
Library services, direct and indirect, 117-118.
Loan services of libraries, 120-121, 123-125.
Lynn, see Murphy (Lynn), Jeannette.

Magliabecchi, Antonio, 145.
Mann, Gregory J., 31 n.
Martel, Charles, 78, 96.
Mediaeval libraries, 3, 4.
Meehan, John, 78.
Merrill, William Stetson, 24, 30, 93 n., 94 n., 186.
Milam, Carl H., 187.
Murphy (Lynn), Jeannette, 97.

National Catholic Educational Association, 167-168, 185-189, 192.
Naudé, Gabriel, 144.
"Newark System," 13.
Newberry Library, 39.
Norton, Charles B., 180.

O'Brien, Albert C., O.F.M., 190.
Open shelves, 132-133.
O'Rourke, William T., 113.

Panizzi, Sir Anthony, 146.
Parish libraries, 25-26.
Perfectionism, naturalistic, 14, 178-179.
Periodicals, selection of, 71-73.
Perry, Eva M., 30, 31, 157 n., 158 n.
Pettee, Julia, 114.
Poole, William F., 39, 152.
Protestant Revolt, influence of on libraries, 4-5.
Publishers' Associations, 176-177.
Publishers, early Catholic, 25.
Putnam, Herbert, 78.

Ratio Studiorum, 99, 100.
Ratti, Achille (Pope Pius XI), 152.
Reading rooms, 134-135.
Reference librarians, 117-118.
Reference services of libraries, 125-126.
Registrum Librorum Angliae, 4.
Ritschl, Friedrich, 150 n.
Routines of library work, 47-51.

St. Benedict's Abbey, Atchison, classification scheme of library, 94.
Sargon I, library of, 2.
Schneider, Joseph, 113-114.
Schrettinger, Martin, 151.
Science, library, 139-140.
Sears, Minnie Earl, 107, 112, 113 n., 115.
Soviet Russia, libraries in, 3.
Standards for library budget, 46-47.
Statistics, library, accuracy of, 8.
Stinson, William M., S.J., 189, 190.
Subject classification, 100.
Subject headings, 106 sqq., 111-114.
Sumner, John S., S.J., on early parish libraries, 25-26.

Teacher librarians, 168-171.
Teachers, librarian's relations with, 51-53.
  Use of library, 27, 28, 29, 131.
Traditions, Catholic, in library work, 163-165, 200-202.
Training schools for librarians, 18, 20, 149 sqq.
  Catholic, 155 sqq.
Tyrannio, Cicero's librarian, 142-143.

United States, character of civilization in early, 7, 8.
  Distribution of libraries in, 9-10.
  Library growth in, 8 sqq.
  Library income in, 10-11.
Use of library, instruction in, 135-136.
Useless books, disposal of, 74-75.

Vatican Library, 111, 191-192, 219.

Wilson, Halsey William, 203 n., 217.
Winsor, Justin, 30.
Women in library work, 19, 136, 180, 181, 182, 208.

Date Due

FACULTY

~~DEC [illegible] 59~~

Z665 .K16
Catholic library problems,
Princeton Theological Seminary–Speer Library
1 1012 00028 6569